17441

NATIONAL LIBRARY
OTTAWA

BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE
OTTAWA

NAME OF AUTHOR....BAIN,........ROBERT BRUCE.....

TITLE OF THESIS...AUTHORITARIAN...MEASURES IN
..CANADIAN..COACHES............
....

UNIVERSITY.....OF...ALBERTA.............................

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED.....M.A...........

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED..........1973...................

Permission is hereby granted to THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

(Signed)..Robert B Bain......

PERMANENT ADDRESS:

...6360 Corwin Cres.
....Niagara Falls Ont
....CANADA.........

DATED..August 7.....1973

NL-91 (10-68)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

AUTHORITARIAN MEASURES IN CANADIAN COACHES

by

© ROBERT BRUCE BAIN

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA
FALL, 1973

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled "Authoritarian Measures in Canadian Coaches", submitted by Robert Bruce Bain, B.A., in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

H A Scott
(Supervisor)

Gary Smith

John Mitchell

Date Aug. 3, 1973

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to examine specific measures of authoritarianism in forty-two coaches of football and basketball teams sponsored by the Public and Separate School Boards of Edmonton, Alberta, Canada. The authoritarian measures examined were the D Scale which the author accepted as a measure of general authoritarianism at the personality level, and the F Scale which the author accepted as a measure of right-wing authoritarianism at the personality level. Two sample groups were created in order to control the confounding variable of education. One group consisted of thirty-two educators employed in the secondary school system of Edmonton while the other sample group was a random sample of thirty-two males from the general population of Edmonton.

The results of the study indicate that the coaches' group sampled had the lowest scores of authoritarianism as measured by both scales when compared to the sample group of educators and the sample group of the male population of Edmonton. The author, on the basis of the significant evidence, concluded that coaches of major team sports in the secondary school systems of Edmonton, Alberta, Canada, are not highly authoritarian in specific measures of general and right-wing authoritarianism.

The secondary problem examined the relationship between personality measures of authoritarianism and a scale created by the author which purported to measure authoritarian coaching attitudes and behaviour. This was done in order to determine if coaching authoritarianism is a specific manifestation of either concept of authoritarianism as advanced by personality theorists. The results of the study indicated that coaches who score highly in the personality measures of authoritarianism may also be predicted to score highly in a measure of coaching attitude and behaviour. The author concluded on the basis of the statistical evidence obtained, that coaching attitudes and behaviour expressed in the CAB Scale may be a manifestation of both general and right-wing authoritarianism. This conclusion was reached on the strength of the highly significant relationships between all scales utilized and in spite of the fact that the F Scale had slightly higher predictive value with respect to the specific coaching authoritarianism scale.

The final purpose of this study was to begin to examine and differentiate situational factors evident in the coaching role as it is evident in Canada as compared to previously discussed psychological factors. The measureable situational factors examined were: (i) age of the coach, (ii) years of coaching experience,

(iii) number of sports coached, and (iv) ratio of players to coach. Although measures of the number of sports coached and the ratio of players to coach did not correlate significantly with the authoritarian measures, the scores obtained in these measures were higher than expected. The author felt that coaches could be overburdened with respect to their coaching workload. This factor, it was hypothesized, could cause coaches to leave coaching after only a few years and the hypothesis was partially born out by results which indicated that only one coach was over the age of thirty-four.

Significant inverse relationships, or relationships approaching significance, were found between the factors of age and coaching experience, and the measures of authoritarianism. Speculative interpretation was advanced in order to offer possible explanations for the results obtained.

In light of the contrasting results of this study as compared to the limited literature (all of which originated in the United States), the author examined cultural factors and socialization process (as it affects coaches) in an effort to explain these differences.

The author concluded that the emphasis upon success as measured by winning, and the emphasis upon sport as big business in the United States, could have a marked influence upon the socialization process and consequently personality variables, one of which might be authoritarianism.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express appreciation to his committee members Professor Garry Smith, Dr. John J. Mitchell and the chairman, Professor Harvey Scott, whose assistance and guidance in preparing this thesis was greatly appreciated. To these three gentlemen, and unnamed others at the University of Alberta, the author extends deepest thanks for years of instruction and discussion upon which a basis for understanding and interpretation was formed.

Sincere thanks is extended to the coaches and educators of the Edmonton Public and Edmonton Separate School Boards who co-operated with the writer and also the respective School Boards for their sanction of this study. Appreciation is also expressed to the subjects from the City of Edmonton, Alberta, Canada who participated in this study.

Finally, the author wishes to express thanks to his wife, Elizabeth, and sons, Christopher and Sandy for their encouragement, understanding and patience throughout this endeavour.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

I STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM 1

Introduction 1

The Problem 4

Secondary Problems 5

Justification for the Study 6

Limitations 8

Delimitations 9

Definition of Terms 10

References 12

II REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 14

Introduction 14

The Authoritarian Personality 14

The California F Scale 22

Critique- The California F Scale 26

The Dogmatism Scale 33

Critique- The Dogmatism Scale 40

The Authoritarian Coach 42

References 52

III METHODS AND PROCEDURE 57

Instrumentation 57

Subjects 61

Procedure 63

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd.)

CHAPTER PAGE

Statistical Treatment 64

References 66

IV RESULTS AND DISCUSSION 69

Rate of Return 69

The Problem 70

Discussion 73

Confounding Variables 74

Age 74

Previous Sports Involvement 75

Previous Athletic Coaching 77

Coaching Experience in Varied Sports. 78

Secondary Problems 78

A. Secondary Problem 78

Discussion 80

B. Secondary Problem 82

Discussion 83

Socialization and Cultural Factors 88

The Canadian Coach 88

V SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 97

Summary 97

Conclusions 99

Recommendations 102

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd.)

PAGE

BIBLIOGRAPHY 104

APPENDIX A: INTRODUCTORY LETTER TO 110
COACHES 110

APPENDIX B: QUESTIONNAIRE COVERING LETTER TO COACHES 112

APPENDIX C: GENERAL INFORMATION SHEET FOR COACHES 114

APPENDIX D: THE COACHES ATTITUDE BEHAVIOR SCALE 116

APPENDIX E: THE QUESTIONNAIRE INCLUDING F AND D SCALES 120

APPENDIX F: FOLLOW UP LETTER TO COACHES AND EDUCATORS 126

APPENDIX G: THANK YOU LETTER TO COACHES AND EDUCATORS 128

APPENDIX H: INTRODUCTORY LETTER SENT TO EDUCATORS 130

APPENDIX I: QUESTIONNAIRE COVERING LETTER 132

APPENDIX J: INTRODUCTORY LETTER SENT TO THE SELECTED MEMBERS OF THE POPULATION 134

APPENDIX K: GENERAL INFORMATION SHEET SENT TO EDUCATORS AND GENERAL POPULATION SAMPLE GROUPS 136

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

I Number of Questionnaire Responses 70

II Age, F and D Scale Scores, and Standard Deviations for All Sample Groups 71

IIIa Standard One Way Analysis of Variance Between All Sample Groups in D Scale Scores 72

IIIb Standard One Way Analysis of Variance Between All Sample Groups in F Scale Scores 72

IV Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients of Age and Authoritarian Measures 75

V Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients Between Authoritarian Measures 79

VI Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients Between F and D Scale Scores for All Sample Groups 82

VII Means For Selected Situational Factors In the Coaches Sample Group 84

VIII Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients of Situational Factors Affecting Authoritarian Measures In the Coaches Sample Group 85

CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Considerable social change has occurred in western society in recent years. Sport, purported to be one of the last bastions supporting the status quo, has received criticism from many sources including students, athletes, sport sociologists, school and public administrators as well as the general population at large. Scott (1), Schecter (2), Wolf (3), Barnes (4), Parrish (5), Hoch (6), and others have exposed the dehumanizing quality of some games, the fraud, racism, drug abuse, violence and the exploitation of sports by big business. Among other "problem areas" singled out by the protesters, one which is most crucial to the very basis of sport has emerged. Today, more than ever before, the authority of the coach is being challenged.

Much of the criticism concerning the authority of the coach is centered around a coaching style which has been referred to as authoritarian in nature. This style has been attributed, in many instances, to the general personality structure of the coach himself. Thus it is no longer an authoritarian style but is actually a personality syndrome known as authoritarianism. The concept of the authoritarian coach results.

The use of the term "authoritarian coach" is one which has become most popular. Men such as Vince Lombardi, Paul "Bear" Bryant and George "Punch" Imlach are coaches who have been labelled "authoritarians". Although the word "authoritarian" does imply questionable connotations, many sport enthusiasts steadfastly believe that "These are the people that the country needs." To enhance this belief, some of these coaches have become "winners" and many people have made the assumption that winning and authoritarianism in coaches are synonymous.

Upon closer examination, problems have recently begun to come to light which question the authoritarian coaching personality and techniques. As a result, a gap has begun to exist between the authoritarian coach and the "new breed" athlete (1)(3)(7)(8)(9).

In spite of all the references to authoritarian coaches very little actual research has been conducted in order to determine if, in fact, there is an authoritarian coaching personality and what the characteristics of this personality might be. The little research which has been done has its roots in the personality theorists' concept of authoritarianism (10). Although many of the characteristics of the "authoritarian personality" are purported to exist in the "authoritarian coach", there has been serious debate as to what exactly is meant by an authoritarian personality.

Adorno *et al*. (11) feel that authoritarianism is anti-democratic tendencies at the personality level. Rokeach (12) feels authoritarianism is the extent to which a person can receive, evaluate, and act on relevant information on its own intrinsic merits. Fromm (13) claims that escaping insecurity and fusing one's self with an "authority", represented authoritarian characters. Maslow (14) described his authoritarian concept as a dangerous and threatening "world view" held by any individual. Other researchers (15)(16)(17) have attempted to define authoritarianism with such measures as conformity, rigidity, intolerance to ambiguity and inflexibility.

With respect to this psychological or trait view of authoritarianism, the present study is an exploratory inquiry into the relationship between the concept of authoritarianism as defined by selected personality theorists and the concept of authoritarianism as it is projected by sport sociologists and the sporting milieu. The study will also attempt to discover with respect to personality theory, the relative degree of authoritarianism between coaches and representative samples of the general population at large.

The interpretation of "authoritarian" coaching personalities based upon psychological theory and measures suggests an additional problem. The very nature of the coaching role may involve situational factors which act upon individuals and cause them to act or appear "authoritarian". Inherent situational factors may also be evident which permit the individual to function more effectively using authoritarian methods. Therefore to conclude that a coach is "authoritarian" by virtue of personality theory-based measures alone, may mot be entirely exhaustive of the authoritarianism concept.

Situational factors which may affect the coaching personality (or specific behavioural aspects of it) may include among others the type of sport which is being coached, the number of athletes involved, the pressure upon the coach to win, the level of competition, the age of the coach in comparison to the athletes or the experience of the coach.

With respect to situational factors (or factors inherent in sport which might affect the coach), this study will examine the age and experience of the selected coaches, the number of athletes coached and the actual sports coached in order to determine if any relationship is evident with respect to coaching authoritarian as it is judged by the behavioural-attitudinal dimension. In addition, a discussion of the socialization process as it might affect the coaching personality will be presented.

The Problem

The relationship between the personality theorists' concept of authoritarianism, and the personality structure and behaviour of coaches has only been superficially explored. It has been implied that the authoritarian personality syndrome is quite pronounced in coaches. It is the author's purpose to explore the contention that the personality theorists' authoritarian syndrome may be more pronounced in athletic coaches as a group when compared to the general population at large. To this end it is hypothesized that a sample of male athletic coaches of major team sports who are employed in the secondary school system in Edmonton, Alberta will measure significantly higher in general authoritarianism as measured by the D (Dogmatism) Scale and in right-wing authoritarianism as measured by the California F Scale when compared to:

1. a sample of educators in Edmonton, Alberta;
2. a sample of the male population of Edmonton, Alberta.

Secondary Problems

1. Coaches are judged to be authoritarian in nature from specific behaviour exhibited while in the act of coaching. This authoritarian coaching behaviour may be a manifestation of the more general authoritarian personality syndrome. Therefore, the relationship between personality measures of authoritarian and coaching authoritarianism will be explored. Coaching authoritarianism is

assessed by a scale designed to measure relative amounts of authoritarian attitudes and behaviour in coaches.

2. The construct "authoritarianism" evokes a wide range of often conflicting meanings and implications. These may be summarized in terms of psychological and situational factors. In an attempt to begin to differentiate between these influences on coaching behaviour various situational factors will be explored. Socialization, (as it relates to coaching) a dominant aspect of personality development, will be discussed in order to discover socio-cultural differences which may have an effect upon "authoritarianism".

Justification for the Study

Although the concept of the "authoritarian coach" has been utilized liberally in the past few years, there have been relatively few authors who have clearly defined their usage of the term "authoritarian". This study attempts to link the research which has been done by personality theorists in authoritarianism and the character of coaches in Edmonton, Alberta, in order to begin to determine if in fact there seems to be an entity known as authoritarianism in these coaches.

Although a dearth of information pertaining to the authoritarian coach exists, the little empirical evidence and speculation which does exist has originated in the

United States of America. There is very little substantial evidence to support the conjecture that the same type of personalities (however indefinite they might be) exist in Canada. Although Canadian and American societies are alike in many respects, the socialization and situational factors in sport in the United States may have a profoundly different effect upon the coaching position there, when compared with the Canadian coaching position. It may be that the emphasis upon competition and the need to achieve success in organized athletics in the United States could have a significant effect upon the coaching role and hence upon the personality and behaviour of the coaches. Since these emphases do not appear to be as pronounced in Canada, the personality of the Canadian coach could be entirely different. If authoritarianism varies with these emphases, authoritarianism in coaches may be a concept of limited usefulness in Canada.

Other situational factors linked to socialization are the surrounding conditions or variables which are present whenever a coach is actually involved in coaching. These situational factors again could have a significant influence upon the personality and behaviour of the coach.

Although the scope of this study does not empirically examine the situational and socio-cultural influences affecting American versus Canadian coaches, relevant literature and data will be presented in order to examine how these factors may influence the coaching role and style.

Finally, this study is an attempt on the author's part to explore, with a view to bridging the "generation" or human relations gap that sometimes exists between player and coach over the question of authority. Today's athlete is as concerned with the question of "why?" as he is of "how?" and many coaches view this as an attempt to question authority. In an attempt to understand attitudes towards authority, the authoritarian personality as it purportedly exists in coaches needs to be explored. Once we as coaches have a better understanding of ourselves and our personalities, it might be easier to understand the wants, needs and personalities of those we coach.

Limitations of the Study

1. The prime limitation of the study was the rate of return of completed questionnaires from the sample groups. Always a factor in studies involving questionnaires sent through the mail, it was hoped that this problem could be partially overcome by the fact that the author was personally acquainted with most of the coaches involved insuring a high response from the group.
2. The validity of the scales measuring aspects of authoritarianism was noted and accepted.

3. The personalities of the subjects who returned the questionnaire may have differed somewhat from the personalities of those who did not return the questionnaire.
4. The questionnaire sent to the coaches was ordered so the Coaches Attitude Behaviour Scale was answered first. This may have had an effect upon the scores of the F and D Scales which followed.
5. The power of the Coaches Attitude-Behavioural Scale to predict observable behaviour of coaches while in the actual act of coaching was limited to self-evaluation in replying to the questions in the questionnaire.

Delimitations of the Study

1. The study was restricted to male coaches of football and basketball teams in the secondary schools in the city of Edmonton, Alberta, Canada. The coaches were all employed by the public or separate school boards of Edmonton at the secondary school level.
2. Secondary school male educators employed by the public or separate school boards of Edmonton were compared to the coaches. These educators closely approximated the education level and the socio-economic status level of the coaches.
3. Male members of the population of Edmonton were compared

to the coaches and educators. Socio-economic status and education levels were partially controlled. This was done by randomly selecting subjects whose jobs did not require a university degree as a qualification.

Definition of Terms

Coach	An individual who instructs, trains and advises an athletic performer or team of athletic performers and is ultimately responsible for individual or team athletic strategies.
Coaching Behaviour	Behaviour occurring within or while in the role of coaching.
Coaching Personality	A personality held by a coach within or while in the role of coaching.
Coaching Situation Factors	Occurrances or inherant qualities within the nature of the coaching role, the athletic milieu or sporting events.
Educator	A sanctioned instructor actively involved in an institutionalized educational setting.
Fascism	Extreme right wing political ideological views or extreme right wing reaction which stands for autocratic government headed by a dictatorial leader and a definable hierarchy of power. Severe economic and social regimentation and forcible suppression of opposition.
Left Wing Political Ideology	Radicalism moving towards socialism and anarchy and exalting a preference for political democracy, civil liberties, humanitarian goals and social equality.

Major Team Sports	Sports sponsored by the secondary schools, having high spectator appeal, and involving more than thirty teams at the junior and senior level per season in the City of Edmonton. The sport must have some form of player interaction designed to achieve a goal or purpose. These sports are basketball and football.
Personality	An individual's attitudes, traits and habits which predispose the individual to behavioural and emotional tendencies.
Right Wing Political Ideology	Reactionary conservatism advocating the forced establishment of an authoritarian political order based upon autocratic government and a definable hierarchy of power.
Secondary School	An institutionalized educational setting housed in a separate building containing grades X, XI and XII.

REFERENCES

1. Scott, J. *The Athletic Revolution*. New York: The Free Press, (1971).

2. Shecter, Leonard. *The Jocks*. New York: Bobbs-Merril Co., Inc., (1969).

3. Wolf, David. *Foul! The Connie Hawkins Story*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, (1972).

4. Barnes, LaVerne. *The Plastic Orgasm*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, (1971).

5. Parrish, Bernie. *They Call It A Game*. New York: Dial Press, (1971).

6. Hoch, Paul. *Rip Off The Big Game: The Exploitation of Sports by the Power Elite*. Garden City: Doubleday & Company, Inc., (1972).

7. Underwood, John. "The Desperate Coach," *Sports Illustrated*, August 25, 1969, 66-76., September 1, 1969, 20-27., September 8, 1969, 28-40.
5

8. Conacher, Brian. *Hockey in Canada: The Way It Is!* Toronto: Gateway Press Limited, (1970).

9. Amdur, Neil. *The Fifth Down: Democracy and the Football Revolution.* New York: Coward, McCann & Geoghegan, Inc., (1971).

10. Kirscht, J. P., and Dillehary. *Dimensions of Authoritarianism: A Review of Research and Theory*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, (1967).

11. Adorno, T. W.; Frendel-Brunswick, E.; Levinson, D.J.; and Sanford, R. N. *The Authoritarian Personality*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, (1950).

12. Rokeach, Milton. *The Open and Closed Mind*. New York: Basic Books, Inc., (1960).

13. Fromm, Erich. *Escape From Freedom*. New York: Farrar & Rinehart, Inc., (1941).

14. Maslow, A. H. "The Authoritarian Character Structure." *The Journal of Social Psychology*, S.P.S.S.I. Bulletin 18, (1943), 401-411.

15. Millon, T. A. "Intolerance of Ambiguity and Rigidity Under Ego and Task Involving Conditions." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 55, (1957), 29-33.

16. Steiner, I., and Johnson, H. "Authoritarianism and Conformity." Sociometry, 26, (1963), 21-34.

17. Stewart, D., and Hoult, T. "A Social-Psychological Theory of the Authoritarian Personality." American Journal of Sociology, 65, (1959), 274-279.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

Authoritarianism is an ambiguous term in personality theory and with respect to coaching attitudes and behaviour. This is in part due to the multitude of meanings and definitions commonly attributed to the term. The author will attempt to limit the meaning and definitions of various authoritarian measures by utilizing the D and F Scales as measures of general and right-wing authoritarianism respectively. In order to justify the inclusion of these authoritarian measures in this study, a review of the literature pertaining to authoritarian concepts and the F and D Scales is necessary.

The Authoritarian Personality

The rise of the Nazi ideology and the world war which followed was the origin of research and speculation concerning a personality structure termed authoritarian. Stagner (1) first touched upon the subject of authoritarianism when he explored Fascist attitudes in 1936. Fromm, (2) writing in 1941, claimed that authoritarianism was a mechanism of escape from the insecurity resulting when "the individual faces the world outside of himself as a completely separate entity (2:140)". The isolated individual's attempt to "escape from freedom" resulted in a "tendency to give up the independence of one's own individual self and to fuse one's self with somebody or something outside of oneself in order to acquire the strength which the individual self is lacking (2:141)". According to Fromm, distinct forms of authoritarianism were found in sado-masochistic strivings or rather the striving for submission and domination. The sado-masochistic character, was referred to as an "authoritarian character". Fromm employed this term because of the individual's attitude towards authority in which "he admires authority and tends to submit to it, but at the same time he wants to be an authority himself and have others submit to him (2:164)". This characteristic caused the authoritarian character to view the world in terms of "power" in which there were but two classifications: powerful and powerless.

An additional characteristic of the authoritarian personality as Fromm envisaged was the conviction that life was "determined by forces outside of man's own self, his interests, his wishes (2:171)". This characteristic manifested itself in an overwhelming belief in fate, the supernatural or even rationalizations of fate such as destiny or "the will of God".

Stimulated by Fromm, Maslow (3) believed that the characteristics of the authoritarian personality needed a unifying philosophy. He termed the basic philosophy "world view" or "weltanschauung". The "world view" was conceived as a sort of human jungle in which the whole jungle was dangerous, threatening and challenging. Maslow felt that in the jungle:

> One's safety lies in one's own strength and this strength consists primarily in the power to dominate. If one is not strong enough, the only alternative is to find a strong protector. If this protector is strong enough and can be relied upon, then peace of a certain sort is possible to the individual (3:403).

Once granted the "world view" Maslow felt authoritarian behaviour became more logical or at least more understandable. Concerned with the Fascist dimension of authoritarianism, the "world-view" helped explain Maslow's authoritarian personality as characterized by the following traits:

1. the tendency to hierarch humans;
2. generalization of superiority-inferiority dimension;
3. strong drive for power;
4. hostility, hatred, prejudice;
5. judged others by external signs of power or status;
6. single value scale;
7. identification of kindness with weakness;
8. tendency to use people;

9. sado-masochistic tendency;
10. unobtainable possibility of satisfaction;
11. guilt feelings and conflict.

Maslow was in agreement with Fromm's authoritarian character, however he did differ with respect to basic theoretical points, particularly the underlying basic philosophy or "world view".

Adorno _et_ _al_. (4) published _The_ _Authoritarian_ _Personality_, in 1950 after years of research and study done by a host of investigators. Initially investigating specific anti-Semitic ideology and prejudice, they discovered that these characteristics were only part of a larger personality syndrome. They devised scales to measure ethnocentrism and political-economic-conservatism in an attempt to identify the personality syndrome which led specifically to prejudice. Their work up until this point had resulted in three scales: the A-S Scale; a specific measure of anti-Semitic ideology; the Ethnocentric (E) Scale and the Political-Economic-Conservatism Scale (PEC).

Their final scale, the F scale, attempted to measure prejudice without appearing to have this aim. It also attempted to estimate a greater and deeper measure; anti-democratic tendencies at the personality level. It was felt that the A-S, E, and PEC scales measured surface opinion, but the F scale was constructed so that it measured general tendencies with sources deep within the often unconscious forces of a person. Termed the Fascist (F) scale and purporting to measure anti-democratic trends, the scale became commonly known as a measure of authoritarian personality conjecture. Another reason the scale began to be referred to in this manner was because it claimed to measure Fascist tendencies and since the Fascist system called themselves authoritarian (because of the dominant role of authority in the social and political structure) the connection was made and the popular title "authoritarian scale" arose.

The creators of the F scale viewed the concept of authoritarianism as a composite of closely cohering subparts of one syndrome. The subparts, termed clusters, were hypothetical and not psychologically real, however, they did have a dynamic relationship to prejudice. These clusters, derived from questionnaire, interview and projective techniques were as follows:

1. Conventionalism;
2. Authoritarian Submission;
3. Authoritarian Agression;
4. Anti-Intraception;
5. Superstition and Stereotype;
6. Power and Toughness;
7. Destructiveness and Cynicism;

8. Projectivity;
9. Sex.

Rokeach (5), convinced that the F scale measured a right-wing ideological authoritarianism, developed the theory of dogmatism; a general authoritarian measure not tied to specific ideology. Pertaining to individual cognitive structure, dogmatism existed not in specific beliefs themselves but in the tenacity with which beliefs existed.

According to Rokeach, there existed in all people belief-disbelief systems. These systems were organized along a central-peripheral dimension depending upon the nature of belief. The core or central region contained the person's "primitive" beliefs which referred to everything the person has acquired about "the nature of the physical world he lives in, the nature of 'self' and the 'generalized other' (5:40)". Attached to the core or central region are a variety of peripheral beliefs dealing with the nature of authority, the actual authority figures, and also the specific beliefs derived from authorities. Rokeach felt that dogmatism was concerned with specific content of core beliefs, but was only concerned with formal content of intermediate or peripheral regions. Consequently he felt similarities among persons in their orientation to authority should be examined and not the specific content of the beliefs. Writing about the distinction between ideology and dogmatism in peripheral beliefs, Rokeach stated that:

> The specific content of peripheral beliefs and disbeliefs, will, of course, again vary from one person to another. It is precisely this specific content to which we look when we wish to ascertain and identify another's ideological position. But what is of major concern here is not so much ideological content as the structural interconnections among peripheral beliefs and, in turn, their structural relations with those beliefs... in the intermediate and central regions (5:47).

The defining characteristics of the dogmatic, closed minded or general authoritarian individual, based upon these criteria are as follows:

1. A sharp distinction between beliefs and disbeliefs;
   Isolation of parts of belief-disbelief system resulting in contradictory beliefs;
   Little differentiation within the disbelief system;
2. A belief that the world one lives in is threatening;
3. Belief that authority is absolute and violators of this authority are not to be tolerated.

A fourth dimension, not based upon previously discussed theory dealt with a time perspective. Rokeach felt that the dogmatic individual would possess...

4. A relatively narrow, future orientated time perspective.

In order to support this theory, Rokeach developed opinionation and dogmatism scales. The Dogmatism Scale or D Scale is now widely used as a measure of general authoritarianism.

There have been many attempts to assess measures of authoritarianism using variations of the scales proposed by Rokeach and Adorno _et al_. Many of these variations have been in the actual length of the scales themselves. Although there have been shortened versions of the scales created (6)(7)(8)(9) many investigators simply delete any number of items in order to arrive at a desired length.

Other variations of the F and D scales have occurred in order to rid the scales of acquiescent response set. Attempts have been made in order to word the items in both positive and negative directions instead of in a negative direction only as the scales presently exist (10)(11)(12). These attempts have met with mixed reactions among investigators and critics.

Although many questions and criticisms exist with respect to the theory underlying the F and D scales, two related concepts of authoritarianism are to be found. The original concept proposed by Adorno _et al_. still has great merit and utility in spite of controversy concerning the F scale. Dogmatism, the later and more general concept of authoritarianism has also been explored and utilized greatly in recent years and seems to be becoming more popular with investigators than the original concept.

In more recent research, traits such as intolerance of ambiguity, rigidity, conformity and inflexibility have been explored as characteristics of authoritarianism. The relative degree of immagination and Eysenck's (13) tender-tough minded dimension have also been explored for possible links with the authoritarian personality; however, no definite conclusions have been reached at this writing.

The California F Scale

In 1950, Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswick, Levinson and Sanford published The Authoritarian Personality. The major emphasis of the research was concerned with identifying the potential fascistic individual. Subsidized by the Department of Scientific Research of the American Jewish Committee, the work originally centered upon discovering the psychological roots of anti-Semitism. From this narrow perspective, the research mushroomed until the major hypothesis was reported to be:

> ...the political, economic, and social convictions of an individual often form a broad and coherent pattern, as if bound together by a "mentality" or "spirit" and that this pattern is an expression of deep lying trends in personality (4:1).

The research team devised three measurement scales concerned with explicit ideology. The Anti-Semitism Scale (A-S), the Ethnocentric Scale (E) and the Political

4

Economic Conservatism Scale (PEC) were successive scales which attempted to identify a personality syndrome which was characterized by an extreme susceptibility to Fascist propoganda. A fourth scale originally hoped to measure antidemocratic tendencies or prejudice without appearing to have this aim and without mentioning the name of any minority group. Called the Fascism Scale (F), it attempted to assess by questionnaire, the personality trends that were also assessed by interview and projective methods. As the scale was being created another use for it was formulated. The scale would also be designed to measure the antidemocratic tendencies deep within the personality of the individual. These conscious or unconscious tendencies made up a syndrome which supposedly identified the personality type referred to by Adorno et al. as "authoritarian". Hence the F Scale became known as a measure of authoritarianism. Although the F Scale correlated moderately with the A-S, E, and PEC Scales it was felt that the F Scale also captured some of the deeper and unexpressed potential which was not evident when the individuals responded towards minority groups. Thus the two aims of the scale, (measure prejudice and antidemocratic trends without appearing so, and estimating these tendencies at the personality level) were realized together.

The scale itself was devised from clinical material previously collected by the research team while creating the A-S, E and PEC Scales. Related studies done elsewhere were also utilized.

Hypothetical constructs, based upon the most significant central personality trends deemed to be evident in the authoritarian individual were derived and defined and made up the content of the F Scale. These constructs or clusters are as follows:

1. Conventionalism	Rigid adherence to conventional middle-class values.
2. Authoritarian Submission	Submissive, uncritical attitude toward idealized moral authorities of the in group.
3. Authoritarian Aggression	Tendency to be on the lookout for, and to condemn, reject, and punish people who violate conventional values.
4. Anti-intraception	Opposition to the subjective, the imaginative, the tender minded.
5. Superstition and Stereotypy	The belief in mystical determinants of the individual's fate; the disposition to think in rigid categories.
6. Power and "Toughness"	Preoccupation with the dominance-submission, strong-weak, leader-follower, dimension, identification with power figures; overemphasis upon the conventionalized attributes of the ego; exaggerated assertion of strength and toughness.

7.	Destructiveness and Criticism	Generalized hostility, vilification of the human.
8.	Projectivity	The disposition to believe that wild and dangerous things go on in the world; the projection outwards of unconscious emotional impulses.
9.	Sex	Exaggerated concern with sexual "goings on" (4:228).

The constructs or clusters of the F Scale are all part of an overall syndrome. They are not psychologically "real" characteristics. Together these clusters distinguish the high scoring individual from a variety of low and moderate scores.

> There exists something like "the" potentially fascist character, which is by itself a "structural unit". In other words, traits such as conventionality, authoritarian submissiveness and aggressiveness, projectivity, manipulativeness, etc., regularly go together. Hence, the "subsyndromes" which we outline here are not intended to violate any of these traits. They are all to be understood within the general frame of reference of the high scorer (4:751).

Like the clusters of the scale, the individual scale items hold no real discriminatory powers. However, the items as a whole (like the clusters or constructs) had "some kind of psychological unity (14:489)". Melvin (15) found a very strong general factor running through all items.

The final form of the scale (Forms 45 and 40) has 29 items. The average of the reliability coefficient based upon fourteen sample groups is .90(N=1518). The degree of reliability attained is within the range which characterizes acceptable intelligence tests. The average means (3.84) are fairly close to the neutral point (4.00) although they vary from one group to another. The discriminatory power of the scale items are such that "the items differentiate significantly between the high and low quartiles (4:259)".

Although the research team spent considerable man-hours on the development of the authoritarian concept and upon the creation of the F Scale, it was still the object of valid criticisms.

Critique - California F Scale

Closely following the publication of The Authoritarian Personality and its California F Scale came a multitude of critiques and investigations into the scope, methods and theories underlying the entire concept. It has been said that "no work in social psychology has been given a more meticulous methodological and conceptual examination (14:509)." From these investigations four main areas of criticism arose.

Rokeach (5) examining the concept of general authoritarianism has concluded that the shift of emphasis from "Fascism in the personality" to "the authoritarian personality" has resulted in conceptual confusion because there is an "unwitting leap from the particular to the general (5:13)." Rokeach feels that we cannot generalize from findings about high F scores. Those who obtain high F scores are authoritarian, but general authoritarianism is not a monopoly held by Fascists, anti-Semites or those viewed as being to the "right" on the political ideological continuum.

Supporting Rokeach, Brown (14) states that the authors of the F scale never referred to it as the Authoritarian Scale. Christie (16) also makes this observation. Brown feels that the many names given to the scale (Implicit Anti-democratic Trends, Potentiality for Fascism or Authoritarian Scale) indicated that the authors felt them to be equivalents. He argues that "Fascism" implies conservative right wing views while "antidemocratic" and "authoritarian" do not. Again this is a jump from the specific to the general. Brown concludes that it is a "serious dispute whether the F Scale assesses only Fascism (authoritarianism of the right) or assesses authoritarianism in general (14:487)" as it implies.

The leap from the particular to the general encompasses political ideology. From the Fascist tendencies to the general authoritarian personality a whole side of the political continuum is engulfed. This is the political left.

Shils (17) has concluded that the researchers responsible for the F Scale have studied only "right" authoritarians and neglected to study "left" authoritarians. Pointing to historical events, Shils outlines inadequacies in the explanation of these events within the concept of the right-left ideology. He feels that authoritarianism can be evident on both sides of the continuum, not just the right as was assumed by the California team. Examining the data Shils noted:

> In conformity with the preconceived idea that authoritarianism is a characteristic of the Right and the corresponding notion that there is no authoritarianism of the "left", there is no analysis of these deviant Low Scorers. It would be presumptuous to assert that it was always the same low scoring individuals who repeatedly received the high ratings in the clinical interviews and that these deviant low scorers were in the main five "Leftists" among the Low Scorers. It was a reasonable interpretation which would justify a re-examination of the original data (17:32).

Coulter (13) has shown that the F Scale does indeed measure Fascistic trends, however a deeper examination into the research has shown that Communists were far below the scores obtained by the Fascists (18)(4). All of the Communist samples have been extremely small, however the consistent low scores seem to illustrate that Communists in democratic countries do not produce high scores in the authoritarian scale. As Brown concludes:

> This can mean either of two things:
> 1. The F Scale only measures authoritarianism of the right or fascism;
> 2. The F Scale measures general authoritarianism in some sense, but communists in democratic countries are not authoritarian.
>
> In any event the Berkeley researchers seem to have been correct in their belief that the F Scale is a measure of fascism (14:529).

Barker (19) supports the contention that the F Scale is biased toward the political right and must be considered a rightist authoritarianism rather than of general authoritarianism.

The method of sampling has also received criticism. The authors of the study hypothesized that their findings could be generalized to the general population. They realized that the sample of persons upon whom the original research was conducted was not a representative sample since all of the subjects were members of at least one formal organization. Christie (10) states that people who belong to formal organizations are in very many respects different from people who do not. Although the authors feel that sampling techniques were coincidental to establishing relationships among attitudes, Hyman and Sheatsley (20) claim that perhaps certain attitudes held only by members of formal organizations cohere into what may be a concern with social issues and therefore may be called an antidemocratic ideology.

Other sampling problems were also evident. As

Hyman and Sheatsley (20) point out, minority group members were excluded and the sample of subjects was drawn from one geographical area. Although these are minor criticisms they also discovered that no control was exercised over the variable of formal education. Reporting data from a National Opinion Research Council survey, it was discovered there was a relationship between five particular F Scale items and years of education. There was a perfectly consistent decline of authoritarianism with increasing education (20).

Subsequent studies have discovered that education or cultural sophistication reduces authoritarianism (21) (22) (23) (24)(25)(26)(27)(28). Since education is one index of socio-economic status (SES) and cultural sophistication, correlations between scores on the F Scale and scores on an SES measure are negative (14)(25)(26)(27) (29)(30)(31).

Perhaps the most serious methodological criticism of the F Scale concerns the questionnaire items themselves. All the questions to which the subject must respond are worded in such a way that agreement with the items represents authoritarianism. The problem of acquiescence response set is therefore introduced. It has been shown that certain subjects may tend to consistently agree or disagree with varying assertations regardless of content (32)(33). Thus if all the questions on a questionnaire were worded in the same direction a manifestation of either a high or low score could result.

Cohn (34) found the F Scale was in part a measure of acquiescence response set. Bass (35) found that the F Scale when reversed in direction yielded only a -20 correlation with the original positive directed scale. It was shown later however that acquiescence response in a negative direction had occurred. Other researchers have also examined the problem of acquiescence response set (36)(37).

Christie (10) reviewing the literature done to date, hypothesized that it is probably not possible to write questionnaire items which are "psychological contraries" to the positive assertations on the F Scale although he attempted to do so with some modifications. Klein (38) supported Christie's hypothesis but rejected the reversed Christie scale.

The feeling that acquiescence response set has actually improved the validity of the scale has also been advanced (39)(40). The researchers felt that a predisposition to repeatedly respond in a set pattern or a predisposition to respond to authoritative items were actually characteristics of an authoritarian personality syndrome. Hence, acquiescence response would tap these traits in the syndrome enhancing the authoritarian measure of the F Scale.

Although it can be concluded that acquiescence

A final area of criticism was centered around the clinical procedures used in order to devise the background and general theory behind the scale itself. Since methodological errors occurred in the original theoretical experiments, critics maintain that these errors will manifest themselves in the actual scale itself. The procedural criticisms centered about:

1. Interviewer knowledge of previous questionnaire responses.
2. Examination of data in advance of coding.
3. Coding of multiple variables from same content.
4. Reporting of reliabilities in terms of coding categories that are too general.

The Dogmatism Scale

Convinced that the F Scale designed by Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswick, Levinson and Sanford was a specific measure of right-wing authoritarianism, Rokeach developed a concept of "dogmatism" which he felt could be termed general authoritarianism. This concept referred to varied individual characteristics which were:

> ...a closed way of thinking which could be associated with any ideology regardless of content, an authoritarian outlook on life, an intolerance towards those with opposing beliefs, and a sufferance of those with similar beliefs (5:4).

Rokeach felt that the discriminating point between dogmatic, response set seems to be a factor in the F Scale, it cannot be a critical factor due to the fact that a relationship between the interviews, TAT stories and projective questions exists and these clinical techniques are free from the effects of response set.

Although the authors of the scale in question realized the danger of acquiescence response set, they originally defended their decision to use unidirectional items because they felt:

1. Negative items tend to be more discriminating.
2. Negative items can be phrased so that they "express subtle hostility without seeming to offend the democratic values which most prejudiced people feel they must maintain (4:59).
3. Most individuals show variable responses.
4. There is a tendency to avoid any extreme position.
5. Similar results were obtained when an all negative scale was inserted into a longer series including positive items.
6. The final test of the scale is the demonstration that high scorers are significantly different from low scorers in a variety of characteristics.

Although it is reported that the authors of the research "were not justified in generalizing their conclusions as widely as they did... they hit on a finding that is as highly reliable and highly general as they, on insufficient evidence, thought it was (14:510)".

close-minded or authoritarian individuals and the non-dogmatic, open-minded or non-authoritarian individuals was not what is believed but how it is believed. Specifically, the structure, and not the content of the belief is the critical variable.

Rokeach, using this theory as a framework, felt that a given personality was based upon "an organization of beliefs or expectancies having a definable and measureable structure (5:7)". The structure envisioned was based upon organization of a belief-disbelief system along three dimensions:

1. a belief-disbelief dimension
2. a central-peripheral dimension
3. a time-perspective dimension.

The belief-disbelief system was felt to include belief systems and disbelief systems that were not necessarily symetrical in nature. Rokeach felt that an individual holding a given system of beliefs could reject a series of systems of alternates or disbeliefs. Thus the conception of the disbelief system was much more than just the mere opposite of the belief system.

Defining the systems, the investigator stated:

> The belief system is conceived to represent all the beliefs, sets, expectancies, or hypotheses, conscious and unconscious, that a person at a given time accepts as true of the world he lives in.
> The disbelief system is composed of a series of subsystems rather than merely a single one, and contains all the disbeliefs, sets, expectancies, conscious and unconscious,

> that, to one degree or another a person at a given time rejects as false (5:33).

The individual's beliefs are organized into the two interdependent parts: a belief system and a disbelief system (composed of several disbelief subsystems). The disbeliefs that are more similar to the belief system are "more acceptable than the less similar ones (5:35)". Within this dimension or continuum several additional properties exist. These are isolation, differentiation and breadth of the system.

Isolation	1.	Co-existance of logically contradictory beliefs within the belief system.
	2.	The accentuation of differences and minimization of similarities between belief and disbelief systems.
	3.	Perception of irrelevance (that which may be relevant).
	4.	Denial of contradiction.
Differentiation	1.	Relative amount of knowledge possessed.
	2.	The perception of similarity between adjacent disbelief subsystems.
Breadth of the System	1.	Total number or range of disbelief subsystems.

In addition to the organization along the belief-disbelief dimension, the system is also organized along a central peripheral dimension.

> (1) A central region represents what will be called the person's "primitive" beliefs. These refer to all the beliefs a person has required about the nature of the physical world he lives in, the nature of "self", and of the "generalized other" (G.H. Mead).
>
> (2) An intermediate region represents the beliefs the person has in and about the nature of authority, and the people who line up with authority, or who he depends to help him form a picture of the world he lives in.
>
> (3) A peripheral region represents the beliefs derived from authority...(5:39).

The third dimension of the belief-disbelief systems is organization along a time perspective. This refers to belief about past, present and future and their interrelation. The time perspective may vary from narrow to broad.

Rokeach hypothesizes that the dogmatic or authoritarian individual has specific characteristics within the organization of the belief-disbelief systems which identify him as authoritarian. Although comparing extremes (highly dogmatic or close minded versus lowly dogmatic or open minded) Rokeach cautions against construing that "people can be classified simply into one or another category (5:5)". Although many individuals are in the moderate category, an attempt to identify the characteristics which identify the close minded, highly dogmatic or the general authoritarian with respect to the moderate group has been made.

DEFINITION I: The Defining Characteristics of Open Closed System

A Belief-Disbelief System is

OPEN	CLOSED
A. to the extent that, with respect to its organization along belief-disbelief continuum,	
1. The magnitude of rejection of disbelief subsystems is relatively low at each point along the continuum;	1. The magnitude of rejection of disbelief subsystems is relatively high at each point along the continuum;
2. There is communication of parts within and between belief and disbelief systems;	There is isolation of parts within and between belief and disbelief systems;
3. There is relatively little discrepancy in the degree of differentiation between belief and disbelief systems;	3. There is relatively great discrepancy in the degree of differentiation between belief and disbelief systems;
4. There is relatively high differentiation within the disbelief system;	4. There is relatively little differentiation within the disbelief system;
B. to the extent that, with respect to the organization along the central peripheral dimension,	
1. The specific content of primitive beliefs (central region) is to the effect that the world one lives in, or the situation one is in at a particular moment is a friendly one;	1. The specific content of primitive beliefs (central region) is to the effect that the world one lives in, or the situation one is in at a particular moment is a threatening one;

2. The formal content of beliefs about authority and about people who hold to systems of authority (intermediate region) is to the effect that authority is not absolute and that people are not to be evaluated at all) according to their agreement or disagreement with such authority;	2. The formal content of beliefs about authority and about people who hold to systems of authority (intermediate region) is to the effect that authority is absolute and that people are to be accepted and rejected according to their agreement or disagreement with such authority;
3. The structure of beliefs and disbeliefs perceived to emanate from authority (peripheral region) is such that its substructures are in relative communication with each other, and finally;	3. The structure of beliefs and disbeliefs perceived to emanate from authority (peripheral region) is such that its substructures are in relative isolation with each other, and finally;

C. to the extent that, with respect to the time perspective dimension, there is,

1. relatively broad time perspective.	1. relatively narrow, future orientated time perspective.

Derived from Definition I, Rokeach formulated Definition II, a simpler and more basic explanation. He stated that:

> ...a basic characteristic that defines the extent to which a person's system is open or closed...[is] the extent to which a person can receive, evaluate, and act on relevant information received from outside on its own intrinsic merits, unencumbered by irrelevant factors in the situation arising from within the person or from the outside (5:57).

Therefore the more open one's belief system, the more able one should be to evaluate and act on information based only upon the information itself and the actual situation. Internal forces should govern and resistance to external sources, rewards or punishments are evident. Conversely, the more closed the belief system, the "more difficult should it be to distinguish between information received about the world and information received about the source (5:58)". He should therefore be ruled to some extent by pressures, rewards and punishments from an outside source not internally related to the information itself.

Using the theoretical concept of the belief-disbelief system, the dogmatism scale (D Scale) was constructed in order to measure individual differences in openness or closedness of belief systems. Since the definition of closed and open mindedness is also that of general authoritarianism and general intolerance (Rokeach), the scale should also serve as a measure of the general personality structures.

The scale was constructed so that strong agreement or disagreement would show one extreme of the characteristic being tapped. Statements appearing in the Dogmatism Scale express ideas familiar to the average person, and often were thought to be authoritarian. Rokeach emphasizes that above all,

> ...each statement in the scale had to be designed to transcend specific ideological positions in order to penetrate to the

> formal and structural characteristics of all positions... Thus, it was our hope that the Dogmatism Scale could be employed as a research tool not only in the Western Countries but also in the Soviet Union and in other Eastern Countries (5:72).

The overall reliability of the final Dogmatism Scale based upon eleven groups (N-408) was .79 with a range of .68 to .93. As Rokeach states:

> These reliabilities are considered to be quite satisfactory, especially when we remember that the Dogmatism Scale contains quite a strange collection of items that cover a lot of territory and appear on the surface to be unrelated to each other (5:90).

The discriminatory power of the items "is borne out by item analysis...[and] they typically show that high and low dogmatic subjects differ consistently and in a statistically significantly manner on the great majority of the items (5:90)".

Critique - The Dogmatism Scale

Very little criticism has been advanced with respect to the D (Dogmatism) Scale as created by Rokeach. Like the California F Scale, Rokeach also uses items which are all worded in the same direction. In the D Scale, all questions are stated so that high agreement with the items indicates a highly dogmatic (or closed mindedness) individual. Rokeach therefore is susceptible to the same criticisms with respect to acquiescence response set as were the authors of the F Scale (41). Rokeach does conclude that "response set is present to at least some degree in the present scale (5:406)". He rejects the position that response set accounts for the many findings of his D Scale on the grounds that:

1. Systematic differences occurred between the D and Opinionation Scales on one hand and the F and E Scales on the other.
2. Differential results were obtained on problem solving when a Rigidity Scale (also worded in a negative direction) and the D Scale were compared.
3. A rich variety of differences between high and low scores on the D Scale cannot be accounted for by response set alone.

Rokeach also mentions the area of intelligence or education as a possible methodological issue. He does control this factor by the observation that the correlation between scores on the Dogmatism Scale and intelligence is typically zero and concludes that it would be hard to account for the findings on the basis of intelligence alone.

The greatest limitation suffered by the theory behind the Open and Closed Mind and the D Scale is the small number of subjects used in an attempt to verify the theory and the statistical levels of significance attained. Although none of the differences between the means of five political groups ever attains a conventional level of statistical significance, Rokeach concludes that:

> In evaluating the outcome of our research effort from a statistical standpoint, the trend of results is a more important consideration from the precise level of significance achieved by a particular set of differences (5:405).

The concept of general authoritarianism or close mindedness as proposed by Rokeach has been examined and supported (19)(42)(43)(44)(45)(46)(47). As a result, numerous investigators have used the D Scale in recent years as a valid measure of that which Rokeach termed dogmatism.

The Authoritarian Coach

The term "authoritarian coach" is based upon behaviour or attitudes exhibited by coaches while in the act of coaching. The term seems to have originated from use by sport psychologists and sport sociologists and spread to the entire sporting milieu. Literature now makes reference to the authoritarian coach and it implies that there is a common definition of syndrome expressed by the authoritarian coach terminology. Richards and Tutko (48) feel that "authoritarian coach" is synonymous with "hard nosed" and state that this type of coach is a,

> ...hard driving and energetic man who demands a certain response from his players and who constantly compels the athlete to strive to achieve well formulated goals...

> This man is best remembered for the forms of "punishment" he devises to enforce his "hard nose" policies (48:17).

Richards and Tutko state this this coaching personality type "has the largest number of coaches within its descriptive boundaries (48:18)". They also feel that most beginning coaches emulate this type of coach partly from the fact that the public typically equates success with this coaching style. The characteristics of the authoritarian coach as discussed by these authors are:

1. a strong belief in discipline;
2. punitive measures to enforce rules;
3. rigid schedules and plans;
4. cruel and sadistic;
5. not a warm personality;
6. organized and well planned;
7. not close interpersonally;
8. religious and moralistic;
9. bigoted and prejudiced;
10. prefers weaker people as assistant coaches;
11. uses threats to motivate.

Underwood (49) states that "The issue is authority and the response to authority (49:40)". Many of the coaches who were reported to have had problems with protests and criticisms in their respective schools had characteristics which were not unlike those termed "authoritarian" by Richards and Tutko. The most outstanding traits being criticized were:

1. prejudice and bigotry;
2. cruel, punitive and threatening;
3. a strong belief in sacrifice and discipline;
4. a failure to accept social change.

Scott (50), referring to research done by Olgilvie and Tutko (51), claims that coaches are one of the, if not the, most authoritarian group of individuals in our society. Scott criticizes the authoritarian coach throughout his book, stating at one point that "the problem athletes are those who willingly submit themselves to authoritarian coaches, not those who are rebelling against these kind of coaches (50:137)". Although he never actually states what he feels is an authoritarian coach, Scott does state that "In the sports world, as in our society at large, individuals representing an authoritarian anti-life force, are lining up in opposition to those representing a creative, humanistic life force (50:121)". Scott feels that the conflicts occurring between these two groups "do not stem from a simple lack of communication or misunderstanding...[but] represent fundamentally opposed views of life (50:122)". Scott pointed to Rafferty's speech "Interscholastic Athletics: The Gathering Storm" (52) as an example of authoritarianism. Although Scott does not specifically state exactly what he terms an authoritarian, he seems to base much of his definition upon Olgilvie and Tutko's (51) discoveries that coaches are not very sensitive to dependency needs in others and that along with this ~~they~~ are "Highly success-driven men with an outstanding need to be on top (51:22)". Scott interprets this as meaning:

> ...that coaches as a group are rather insensitive in their interpersonal relationships, and that, in an effort to produce winning teams, they quite readily manipulate and exploit others (50:134).

The concept of an authoritarian coach has been used to cover a vast range of coaching personalities, behaviour, and attitudes. Common usage of the term often refers to the actual coaching behaviour of coaches. Wolf (53) in his reference to coach Jim Harding stated:

> He was a living shrieking example of what happens when all those coachly values of discipline; conformity, patriotism, and uncompromising insistance on victory are carried to the ultimate (53:243).

Not unlike many other coaches who are termed authoritarian, Harding demanded "total conformity and absolute obedience [and was convinced] that anything could be accomplished through shouts and threats and punishment (53:243).

Conacher (54) and Barnes (55) also illustrate coaching behaviour which is often viewed as authoritarian. Conacher felt that George "Punch" Imlach was "obsessed with the idea that he was the absolute boss (54:74)" and often enforced his strict discipline and gruelling practices with threats and a system of monetary fines. Barnes writes that "the most successful coaches are the ones with the worst reputations for brutality or meanness (55:15)". Discipline is a key word, Barnes feels, and anyone who does not conform to the system such as the "smart ass kids with long hair thinking about social problems (55:15)" cannot be tolerated by this type of coach.

Dowling (56) and Kramer (57) writing about coach Vince Lombardi, noted his often inhumane treatment of players. Lombardi's coaching techniques included screaming insults, total disregard for physical injuries, and punishing practices during which players were often pushed beyond their physical limitations. He was accused by one of his players of treating "us all the same, like dogs (58:120)".

Other examples of authoritarianism are thought to exist in the strict rules and regulations which are often laid down by some coaches. These regulations attempt to insure discipline, uniformity and a bending respect for authority. Often players are made to sign pledges (before they are allowed to participate) stating total acceptance of the coach's regulations (59). Violations of the pledge are a serious offense often ending up in expulsion from the team, or in the American Universities, loss of scholarship. Although many rules and regulations are justified by claiming improved performance ~~levels~~, many coaches include regulations which do not allow for individual variations. Often the system of regulations attempts to rigidly control social, moral, and religious matters not related to sport.

As Scott has suggested, in an effort to produce winning teams, coaches often exploit and manipulate the athletes. Lombardi convinced his players to play when seriously injured by raving "No one is ever hurt... Hurt is in your mind (58:121)". Meggessy (60) cites instances of players being forced to adhere to the coaches wishes even though the best interests of the athlete were not taken into account. Wolf (53) and Parrish (61) both suggest that some coaches are only concerned with their record and their reputations and will use any tactic necessary regardless of the consequences to the players in order to win.

Although the labelling of authoritarianism in coaches is popularly based upon behaviour and attitudes expressed while coaching, coaches who have been judged as authoritarian in this manner also tend to express opinions concerning the nature of general authority which may also be termed authoritarian with respect to personality theory. Lombardi has said that "The individual has to have respect for authority regardless of what that authority is (59:93)". Of the nature of man's relationship to authority he continued "...we must regain respect for authority because to disavow it is contrary to our individual natures (58:121)".

With this in mind, it is easy to see that coaches with this opinion cannot tolerate anyone who does not show unquestionable respect for authority or who does not adhere to the appropriate values of the day. Indeed many coaches have mentioned their repulsion of those who did not dress or act as the coach felt they should (49) (52)(53)(54)(55)(56)(57)(58)(61) and this sentiment is reflected typically:

> "Look at those wierdos...Look at that
> will ya. I bet their faggots. That's
> what's wrong with this country (53:262)".

The popularity of the term "authoritarian coach" and its vast range of behaviour, attitudes and personality has resulted in some confusion. Overuse of the term has caused it to become general and non-specific. Consequently empirical verification of the concept has become extremely difficult unless some specific segment of a wide range of alternatives within the concept is selected, defined and examined.

A re-examination of authoritarianism, as it is discussed by Adorno _et al_. (4), has great utility in analysing the personality characteristics of coaches who are popularly held to be authoritarian. There are strong similarities between the personality traits which Adorno _et al_. feel are characteristic of authoritarians and those traits which are extremely evident in coaches who are judged authoritarian. If the popular conception of an authoritarian coach's behaviour (attitude and personality) is examined closely, two general areas are evident.

They are:

1. An emphasis upon strict adherence to rules-regulations.
   - a belief in strict discipline
   - punitive, cruel, sadistic
   - intolerance with violators, disbelievers
   - use of threats to enforce and motivate
   - rigid, unflexing schedules, plans, rules, regulations

2. Insensitivity to interpersonal relationships with athletes.
   - unconcerned with athlete-coach communication
   - not personally warm or close
   - aloof
   - concerned with self.

Coaches who characteristically coach in this manner all seem to have personality traits which are strongly similar to the Adorno _et al_. traits of authoritarianism. Specifically these traits are:

1. Conventionalism
   - oriented toward ingroup morals and standards of behaviour (middle class)
   - lack of extremeism

2. Belief in a Hierarchy of Authority
   - uncritical attitude toward recognized authority

3. A Preoccupation with Violators of Conventional Values
   - to be on the lookout to condemn, reject and punish those who violate conventional standards
   - belief that hostility and evil forces are undermining society and its institutions

4. Preoccupied with Power-Toughness
   - identification with power figures
   - concerned with dominant-submissive, strong-weak, leader-follower dimensions
   - a generalized intolerance towards

the weak and tenderminded
(subjective, imaginitive).

Rokeach's (5) conception of authoritarianism is somewhat different from the concept held by Adorno _et al_. Lacking specific ideology, the conception is based upon the hypothesis that the tenacity at which an idea is held measures authoritarianism. Rokeach felt that the closing of one's mind to relevant information represented authoritarianism. Although Rokeach and earlier authoritarian personality speculators (1)(2)(3) are similar with respect to some beliefs about authority, dogmatism or general authoritarians as envisaged by Rokeach is a unique measure.

Applying Rokeach's conception of authoritarianism to the popular conception of an authoritarian coach seems on the surface to have little or no justification. However, a closer examination of the degree to which popularly classified authoritarian coaches hold their beliefs reveal that these individuals reportedly claim to hold a monopoly on the truth and stubbornly refuse to experiment or accept anything except that which they themselves adhere (49)(50)(51)(52)(54)(55)(57)(58)(59)(60)(62). It is the author's belief that a measure of the personality traits outlined by Adorno _et al_. in combination with a measure of the tenacity with which they are held, may be extremely useful in judging coaching authoritarianism at the personality level.

REFERENCES

1. Stagner, R. "Fascist Attitudes: An Exploratory Study". *Journal of Social Psychology*, 7, (1936), 309-319.

2. Fromm, Erich. *Escape From Freedom*. New York: Farrar & Rinehart, Inc., (1941).

3. Maslow, A. H. "The Authoritarian Character Structure". *The Journal of Social Psychology*, S.P.S.S.I. Bulletin, 18, (1943), 401-411

4. Adorno, T. W.; Frenkel-Brunswick, E.; Levinson, D.J.; and Sanford, R. N. *The Authoritarian Personality*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, (1950).

5. Rokeach, Milton. *The Open and Closed Mind*. New York: Basic Books, Inc., (1960).

6. Schulze, Rolf H. K. "A Shortened Version of the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale". *Journal of Psychological Studies*, 13, (1962), 93-97

7. Powell, F. A. and Troldahl, V. C. "A Short-Form Dogmatism Scale for Use in Field Studies". *Social Forces*, 44, (1965), 211-215.

8. Sanford, F. H. and Older, H. J. A Short Authoritarian-Equalitarian Scale. Philadelphia: Institute for Research in Human Relations. (1970).

9. Department of Scientific Research of the American Jewish Committee. 5 Item F Scale. Unpublished Scale.

10. Christie, R., Havel, Joan, and Seidenburg, B. "Is the F Scale Irreversible?" *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 56, (1958), 143-159.

11. Berkowitz, N. H., and Wolkin, G. H. "A Forced Choice Form of the F Scale Free of Acquiescience Response Set". *Sociometry*, 24, (1964), 54-56.

12. Strickland, J. H. and Janicki, W. P. "An Alternative Form of Forced Choice F Scale". *Psychological Reports*, 16, (1965), 933-940.

13. Eysenck, M. J. *The Psychology of Politics*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, (1954).

14. Brown, Roger. *Social Psychology*. New York: The Free Press, (1965).

15. Melvin, D. "An Experimental and Statistical Study of Two Primary Social Attributes". Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of London, (1955).

16. Christie, R. "Authoritarianism Re-examined", in *Studies in the Scope and Method of the Authoritarian Personality*. Edited by R. Christie and M. Jahoda. Glencoe: The Free Press, (1954).

17. Shils, Edward A. "Authoritarianism: "Right" and "Left", in Studies in the Scope and Method of the Authoritarian Personality. Edited by R. Christie and M. Jahoda. Glencoe: The Free Press, (1954).

18. Coulter, Thelma. "An Experimental Statistical Study of the Relationship of Prejudice and Certain Personality Variables". Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of London, (1953).

19. Barker, Edwin B. "Authoritarianism of the Political Right, Center, and Left". Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Columbia University, (1958).

20. Hyman, H. H., and Sheatsley, Paul B. "'The Authoritarian Personality' - A Methodological Critique", in *Studies in the Scope and Method of the Authoritarian Personality*. Edited by R. Christie and M. Jahoda. Glencoe: The Free Press, (1954).

21. MacKinnon, W. J. and Centers, R. "Authoritarian and Urban Stratification". *American Journal of Sociology*, 61, (1956), 610-620.

22. Kornhauser, A., Sheppard, H. L. and Mayer, A. J. *When Labor Votes*. New York: University Books, (1956).

23. Cohn, T. S. and Carsh, H. "Administration of the F Scale to a Sample of Germans". *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 49, (1954), 471.

24. Jacobson, F. N. and Rettig, S. "Authoritarianism and Intelligence". *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 50, (1959), 213-219.

25. McDill, F. L. "Anomie, Authoritarianism, Prejudice, and Socio-economic Status: An Attempt at Clarification". Social Forces, 39, (1961), 239-245.

26. Roberts, A. H. and Rokeach, M. "Anomie, Authoritarianism, and Prejudice: A Replication". American Journal of Sociology, 61, (1956), 335-358.

27. Srole, L. "Social Integration and Certain Corollaries: An Exploratory Study". American Sociological Review, 21, (1956), 709-716.

28. Christie, R. and Jahoda, M. (editors), Studies in the Scope and Method of the Authoritarian Personality. Glencoe: The Free Press, (1954).

29. Lipset, S. M. "Democracy and Working Class Authoritarianism". American Sociological Review, 24, (1959), 482-501.

30. Lipset, S. M. Political Man. New York: Double Day, (1960).

31. Lipsitz, L. "Working Class Authoritarianism: A Re-evaluation". American Sociological Review, 30, (1965), 103-109.

32. Couch, A. and Keniston, K. "Yeasayers and Naysayers: Agreeing Response Set as a Personality Variable". Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 60, (1960), 151-174.

33. Cronbach, L. J. "Response Sets and Test Validity". Education Psychology Measurement, 6, (1946), 475-494.

34. Cohn, T. S. "The Relation of the F Scale to a Response to Answer Positively". American Psychology, 8, (1953), 335.

35. Bass, B. M. "Authoritarianism or Acquiescience?" Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 51, (1955), 616-623.

36. Jackson, D. N. and Messick, S. J. "A Note on 'Ethnocentrism' and Acquiescience Response Set". Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 40, (1957), 215-221.

37. Chapman, L. J. and Campbell, D. T. "Response Set in the F Scale". Journal of Abnormal and Social

Psychology, 54, (1957), 124-132.

38. Klein, E. B. "A Factorial Analysis of the F and Reversed F Scale in 3 Regional Samples". Journal of Social Psychology, 65, (1965), 127-134.

39. Leavitt, H. J., Hax, H. and Roche, J. H. "'Authoritarianism' and Agreement with Things Authoritative". Journal of Psychology, 40, (1955), 215-221.

40. Gage, N. L., Leavitt, G. S. and Stone, G. C. "The Psychological Meaning of Acquiescience Set in Authoritarianism". Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 55, (1957), 98-103.

41. Lichtenstein, D., Quinn, R. R. and Hover, G. C. "Dogmatism and Acquiescience Response Set". Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 63, (1961), 636-638.

42. Kerlinger, F. and Rokeach, M. "The Factorial Nature of the F and D Scales". Journal of Personal and Social Psychology, 4, (1966), 391-399.

43. Fructer, R., Rokeach, M. and Novak, E. "A Factorial Study of Dogmatism, Opinionation and Related Scales". Psychological Reports, 4, (1958), 19-22.

44. Hanson, D. J. "Dogmatism and Authoritarianism". The Journal of Social Psychology, 76, (1968), 89-95.

45. Plant, W. T. "Rokeach's Dogmatism Scale as a Measure of General Authoritarianism". Psychological Reports, 6, (1960), 164.

46. Rokeach, M. and Fructer, B. "A Factorial Study of Dogmatism and Related Concepts". Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 53, (1956) 356-360.

47. Rokeach, M. "Political and Religious Dogmatism: An Alternative to the Authoritarian Personality". Psychological Monologue, 70, (1956), no. 18.

48. Richards, J. and Tutko, T. The Psychology of Coaching. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.

49. Underwood, John. "The Desperate Coach", Sports Illustrated, August 25, 1969, 66-76, September 1, 1969, 20-27, September 8, 1969, 28-40.

50. Scott, J. The Athletic Revolution. New York: The Free Press, (1971).

51. Olgilvie, Bruce C. and Tutko, T. Problem Athletes and How to Handle Them. London: Pelham Books, (1966).

52. Rafferty, Max. "Intercollegiate Athletics: The Gathering Storm", in Scott, J. The Athletic Revolution. New York: The Free Press, (1971).

53. Wolf, David. Foul! The Connie Hawkins Story. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, (1972).

54. Conacher, Brian. Hockey In Canada: The Way It Is! Toronto: Gateway Press Limited, (1970).

55. Barnes, LaVerne. The Plastic Orgasm. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, (1971).

56. Dowling, Tom. Coach: A Season With Lombardi. New York: Popular Library, (1970).

57. Kramer, Jerry. Instant Replay: The Green Bay Diary of Jerry Kramer. Edited by Dick Schaap. Toronto: The New American Library of Canada, Limited, (1969).

58. Shecter, Leonard. The Jocks. New York: Bobbs-Merril Co., Inc., (1969).

59. Hoch, Paul. Rip Off The Big Game: The Exploitation of Sports by the Power Elite. Garden City: Doubleday & Company, Inc., (1972).

60. Meggessy, Dave. Out of Their League. Berkeley: Ramparts Press, Inc., (1971).

61. Parrish, Bernie. They Call It A Game. New York: Dial Press, (1971).

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURE

Instrumentation

A. The Dogmatism Scale

The Dogmatism Scale or D Scale as created by Rokeach is a measure of general authoritarianism within an individual of any given social or political belief. General authoritarianism or closed mindedness is characteristic of an individual who "cannot receive, evaluate and act on relevant information received from the outside on its own intrinsic merits unencumbered by irrelevant factors in the situations arising from within the person or from the outside (1:57)". Unlike the California F Scale, the D Scale measures general authoritarianism which is free from ideological content. Therefore, general authoritarianism can best be thought of as a mode of thought, rather than a specific set of beliefs (1).

The reliability of the Dogmatism Scale ranges from .68 to .93 with an average of .79. These reliabilities were obtained from eleven groups with N=408.

The author, while acknowledging the fact that response set may be a minor factor influencing the ultimate validity of the scale, rejected the position that the D Scale suffers significantly from acquiescence response set.

B. The California F Scale

The California F Scale is not a measure of general authoritarianism as originally hypothesized (2) but is a combined measure of ideology (conservatism of the political right) and authoritarianism of an anti-democratic nature (1)(3)(4)(5)(6)(7).

Since it has been shown that education significantly affects the score of the F Scale (8)(9)(10)(11)(12)(13) an attempt was made to control for education level of the subjects.

The author while considering the criticisms made by a number of investigators (14)(15)(16)(17)(18)(19) who felt that the F Scale may be strongly influenced by acquiescence response set, accepted instead the arguments made by the original authors of scale (2) and the arguments of critics who defend and support the validity of F Scale scores (20)(21) (22) (23). It was therefore concluded that for the purposes of this study that for the F Scale, acquiescent response set was only a minor factor influencing subjects' answers.

The reliability of the final form of the F Scale is .90 with an N=1518. The average means (3.84) are near the mid point (4.00) and it has been shown that the discriminatory power of the scale items are significant (2).

C. The Coaches Attitude-Behaviour Scale

The Coaches Attitude-Behaviour Scale was designed in order to measure the relative amounts of authoritarian attitude and behaviour of coaches as it pertains to athletic coaching situations. It was assumed that the specific behaviour and attitudes of the coaches contacted would be reflected in their response to the test items.

The actual items in the scale are based upon overt examples of coaching authoritarian behaviour and attitude. These examples are divided into subclassifications which approximate those outlined by Tutko and Richards (24). The items themselves express coaching authoritarianism which has been discussed by Richards and Tutko (24) and reflected by individuals in a host of sporting critiques in recent years (25)(26)(27)(28)(29). These items are also based upon attitudes and behaviour which were deemed authoritarian in nature from observations of a personal nature made over the years from experiences as a coach and player. It may be noted that discussions with fellow coaches, players and referees have also contributed to the items in the scale.

The Scale itself is composed of twenty-five items which can be divided into six subclassifications. These subclassifications are:

1. Aloof - Not Personally Warm or Close
2. Unconcerned with Communication (of a two way nature)
3. Concerned with Self
4. A Rigid Belief in Discipline, Rules, Regulations, Organization
5. Punitive, Threatening
6. Intolerant of Violators

The items were constructed in order to positively state an authoritarian attitude as suggested by each of the subclassifications. Some items were a combination of two or more subclassifications. The items used in each subclassification of the scale are:

Aloof - Not Personally Warm or Close
Items - 1, 5, 10, 11, 15, 16

Unconcerned with Communication of a two way Nature
Items - 3, 6, 12, 25

Concerned with Self
Items - 5, 14, 17, 20

Rigid Belief in Discipline, Rules, Regulations, Organization
Items - 4, 13, 15, 21, 22, 23, 24

Punitive, Threatening
Items - 4, 7, 8, 9, 19, 22

Intolerant of Violators
Items - 2, 4, 18, 19, 20

The instructions for the Coaches Attitude-Behaviour Scale closely approximated the instructions given for the D and F Scales.

As in the D and F Scales, the items were scored by a Likert forced choice scaling technique which stated:

+3 I agree very much
+2 I agree on the whole
+1 I agree a little
-1 I disagree a little
-2 I disagree on the whole
-3 I disagree very much

The examiner upon receiving the completed scale adds the sum of four to each of the subject's indicated item score and totals the twenty-five items. By dividing by twenty-five an item average is obtained.

Since it is the total aspect of coaching authoritarian behaviour and attitude which is to be explored, no record was noted of the scores obtained within the subclassifications used to create the scale.

The decision to word all questionnaire items in a positive direction (strong positive agreement indicates authoritarianism) was made in order to insure continuity of response with respect to the other two scales. The author also felt that the individuals would show varied response and would tend to avoid the extreme positions unless a firm conviction was felt.

Subjects

The study was restricted to male subjects in the City of Edmonton, Alberta, Canada. Each subject was preselected in order to create three sample groups. These groups were as follows:

a) The Coaches Sample Group
b) The Educator-Non Coach Sample Group
c) The Non Coach - Non Educator Sample Group

a) The Coaches Sample Group

The entire head coaching population in major team sports in the City of Edmonton secondary school system was contacted. These coaches were all employed as educators in the school system in Edmonton. There were sixty-one subjects contacted in this sample group.

b) The Educators Sample Group

Sixty-four male educators employed by the City of Edmonton public and separate school boards were contacted. The educators were randomly selected by computer. All members of this control group were non-active coaches of major team sports and were not employed as physical education teachers. Although a small number of this group had previously coached team sports for varying time periods, none of those were actually involved at the time contacted.

c) The Non-Coach, Non-Educator Sample Group

Sixty-five members of the general population at large of the City of Edmonton were randomly selected from the 1972 City of Edmonton Directory. The sample members were non-educators and it was hoped that most were not actively involved in coaching at the time selected.

Procedure

The subjects were pre-selected to membership in one of the three sample groups. Each subject in the Coaches Sample Group and the Educator Non-Coach Sample Group were contacted by an introductory letter (see Appendix A). A packet containing the questionnaire(s) and a stamped return envelope was then sent three days later. If after two weeks the subjects had not replied, a follow-up letter was sent (see Appendix F). A fourth letter, a thank-you letter to those subjects who had returned the completed questionnaire, was sent (see Appendix G).

The subjects who were pre-selected to the Non-Educator Non-Coach Sample Group were only contacted once. Included in the packet was an introductory letter thanking them in advance for completing the questionnaire (see Appendix J), the questionnaire itself (see Appendix E), and a stamped return envelope.

The Questionnaire

The questionnaire was a combination of both D and F Scales. The questionnaire contained sixty-eight items of which the first forty were the D Scale and the last twenty-eight the F Scale. The D Scale remained exactly as Rokeach had designed it while one item was omitted from the F Scale due to its antiquity. The actual items in the questionnaire were preceded by detailed instructions and a short general information sheet (see Appendix K). The general information sheet varies slightly for the Coaching Sample Group (see Appendix C).

The Coaching Sample Group also was asked to complete a second questionnaire. This twenty-five item scale was the Coaches Attitude-Behaviour Scale (see Appendix D). Preceding this scale was a set of instructions which closely approximated the instructions for the questionnaire.

The Coaches Attitude-Behaviour Scale was affixed before the questionnaire and it is probable that the coaches answered this questionnaire first. The author felt that due to the length of the total number of items involved for the Coaches Sample Group, it would be best to complete a short and more interest-orientated scale first.

Statistical Treatment

The Problem

Means and standard deviations were calculated for each of three sample groups in measures of the F and D Scales. A one way analysis of variance was computed between sample groups in means of the F Scale and the D Scale. A Newman-Keuls comparison matrix was utilized. Significance was accepted at the .05 level of confidence.

Secondary Problems

1. Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients were computed between scores obtained by the sample groups of coaches in the F and D Scales as compared to the Coaches Attitude-Behaviour Scale. Probabilities were computed and significance was accepted at the .05 level of confidence.

2. Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients were calculated between coaching characteristics of age, number of years coached, sports coached and number of players coached (ratio), with scores obtained in the F, D, and CAB Scales. Probabilities were computed and significance was accepted at the .05 level of confidence.

Confounding Variables

Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients were computed between scores in the D and F Scales and the ages of each sample group. Significance was accepted at the .05 level of confidence.

Means were computed for the non-physical education teacher-coach and compared to the means of the physical education teacher-coach.

Means were also computed for the coaching-experienced educator and compared to the means of the non-coach experienced educator.

REFERENCES

1. Rokeach, Milton. *The Open and Closed Mind*. New York: Basic Books, Inc., (1960).

2. Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswick, E., Levinson, D. J. and Sanford, R. N. *The Authoritarian Personality*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, (1950).

3. Coulter, Thelma. "An Experimental and Statistical Study of the Relationship of Prejudice and Certain Personality Variables". Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. University of London, (1953).

4. Kirscht, J. P. and Dillehay. *Dimensions of Authoritarianism: A Review of Research and Theory*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, (1967).

5. Christie, R. "Authoritarianism Re-examined", in Studies in the *Scope and Method of the Authoritarian Personality*. Edited by R. Christie and M. Jahoda. Glencoe: The Free Press, (1954).

6. Shils, Edward A. "Authoritarianism: 'Right' and 'Left'", in Studies in the *Scope and Method of the Authoritarian Personality*. Edited by R. Christie and M. Jahoda. Glencoe: The Free Press, (1954).

7. Barker, Edwin B. "Authoritarianism of the Political Right, Center, and Left". Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Columbia University, (1958).

8. Hyman, H. H. and Sheatsley, Paul B. "'The Authoritarian Personality' - A Methodological Critique", in *Studies in the Scope and Method of the Authoritarian Personality*. Edited by R. Christie and M. Jahoda. Glencoe: The Free Press, (1954).

9. MacKinnon, W. J. and Centers, R. "Authoritarianism and Urban Stratification". *American Journal of Sociology*, 61, (1956), 610-620.

10. Kornhauser, A., Sheppard, H. L. and Mayer, A. J. *When Labor Votes*. New York: University Books, (1956)

11. Cohn, T. S. and Carsh, H. "Administration of the F Scale to a Sample of Germans". *Journal of Abnormal* and Social Psychology, 49, (1954), 471.

12. Jacobson, F. N. and Rettig, S. "Authoritarianism and Intelligence". The Journal of Social Psychology, 50, (1959), 213-219.

13. Brown, Roger. Social Psychology. New York: The Free Press, (1965).

14. Couch, A. and Keniston, K. "Yeasayers and Naysayers" Agreeing' Response Set as a Personality Variable". Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 60, (1960), 151-174.

15. Cronbach, L. J. "Response Sets and Test Validity". Education Psychology Measurement, 6, (1946), 475-494.

16. Cohn, T. S. "The Relation of the F Scale to a Response to Answer Positively". American Psychology, 8, (1953), 335.

17. Bass, B. M. "Authoritarianism or Acquiescence?" Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 51, (1955), 616-623.

18. Jackson, D. N. and Messick, S. J. "A Note on 'Ethnocentrism' and Acquiescence Response Set". Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 40, (1957), 215-221.

19. Chapman, L. J. and Campbell, D. T. "Response Set in the F Scale". Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 54, (1957), 124-132.

20. Christie, R., Havel, Joan, and Seidenbu~~rg, B.~~ "Is the F Scale Irreversible?" Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 56, (1958), 143-159.

21. Klein, E. B. "A Factorial Analysis of the F and Reversed F Scale in 3 Regional Samples". Journal of Social Psychology, 65, (1965), 127-134.

22. Leavitt, H. J., Hax, H. and Roche, J. H. "Authoritarianism and Agreement with Things Authoritative". Journal of Psychology, 40, (1955), 215-221.

23. Gage, N. L., Leavitt, G. S. and Stone, G. C. "The Psychological Meaning of Acquiescence Set in Authoritarianism. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 55, (1957), 98-103.

24. Rokeach, M. "Political and Religious Dogmatism: An Alternative to the Authoritarian Personality". *Psychological Monologue*, 70, (1956), NO. 18.

25. Scott, J. The Athletic Revolution. New York: The Free Press, (1971).

26. Meggessy, Dave. *Out of Their League*. Berkeley: Ramparts Press, Inc., (1971).

27. Underwood, John. "The Desperate Coach". *Sports Illustrated*. August 25, 1969, 66-76. September 1, 1969, 20-27, September 8, 1969, 28-40.

28. Wolf, David. *Foul! The Connie Hawkins Story*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, (1972).

29. Hoch, Paul. *Rip Off The Big Game: The Exploitation of Sports by the Power Elite*. Garden City: Doubleday & Company, Inc., (1972).

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Rate of Return

The questionnaires which returned from the sample groups were scored and the data from the general question sheet was recorded. Sixty-one questionnaires were sent to the coaching sample group and forty-four were returned. Of these forty-four two were marked incorrectly and two were only partially marked. The resulting number of completed scores in the coaching sample group was forty, however forty-two scores for the Coaching Attitude-Behaviour Scale were received and recorded.

The sample group of educators returned thirty-five questionnaires. Three of these returns were eliminated due to errors or incorrect marking procedures, leaving a return number of thirty-two. This represents fifty percent of the questionnaires sent.

A third sample group comprised of members of the male population of Edmonton, Alberta, Canada, showed a similar return rate as compared to the "educator" group sampled. Sixty-five questionnaires were sent and thirty-six were returned. Two of these returns were unanswered, one was returned with an incorrect marking technique and a fourth questionnaire was sent back by the family of a deceased subject. This left thirty-two scores in this sample group or approximately fifty percent of the contacted population group.

The Problem

The author's purpose was to discover if in fact the authoritarian personality syndrome, as it has been hypothesized by personality theorists (1)(2), was as pronounced in coaches as it has been implied (3)(4)(5). Three sample groups were created in order to control the education variable (TABLE I). The scores of the three sample groups (in measures of right-wing authoritarianism as measured by the F Scale and general authoritarianism as measured by the D Scale) were reduced to a per item average. The neutral point in the scales was "4" and authoritarianism ranged from a high of "7" to a low of "1".

TABLE I

Number of Questionnaire Responses

	F Scale	D Scale	CABS Scale
Coaches Sample Group	40	40	42
Educators Sample Group	32	32	-
General Population Sample Group	32	32	-

The results of the testing do not support the literature which claims coaches as a group are "one of the, if not the most authoritarian group of individuals in our society (5:123)". The sample of coaches had the lowest means in the F and the D Scale measures as compared to the means of the other sample groups (TABLE II). The educators scored slightly higher in both F and D Scales while the general population sample had the highest means in both measures of authoritarianism.

TABLE II

Age, F and D Scale Scores, and Standard Deviations For All Sample Groups

	Age	F Scale	S.D.	D Scale	S.D.
Coaches Sample Group	29.098	3.191	.922	3.204	.668
Educators Sample Group	34.344	3.211	.796	3.336	.631
General Population Sample Group	39.938	3.828	.690	3.638	.576

An analysis of variance indicates that the difference in means between the coaches sample group and the sample group of members of the male population of Edmonton is significant at the .05 level of confidence (TABLE III). The scores of the educators sample group are extremely close to the coaching group and the difference in means is not significant for the F Scale.

TABLE IIIa

Standard One Way Analysis of Variance Between All Sample Groups on the D Scale

Newman-Keuls Comparison Between Means

	Coaches Sample Group	Educators Sample Group	General Population Sample Group
Coaches Sample Group	0		
Educators Sample Group	6.288*	0	
General Population Sample Group	18.381*	12.094*	0

* Significant at the .01 level of confidence

TABLE IIIb

Standard One Way Analysis of Variance Between All Sample Groups on the F Scale

Newman-Keuls Comparison Between Means

	Coaches Sample Group	Educators Sample Group	General Population Sample Group
Coaches Sample Group	0		
Educators Sample Group	.0556	0	
General Population Sample Group	17.838*	17.281*	0

* Significant at the .01 level of confidence

Discussion

It was noted by the author ~~that~~ of sixty-two coaches of major team sports in the Separate or Public School Systems of Edmonton, Alberta, Canada, only four of these coaches (or six percent) were not actually educators. Thus a sample group of educators was created in order to control the additional variable of education (or teaching experience). The coaches sample group therefore differed primarily from the educators sample group in the variable of coaching. The findings in this study can be interpreted in light of the education factor. As noted earlier it has been hypothesized that education or cultural sophistication has an inverse relationship to at least one of the two authoritarian measures (6)(7)(8)(9)(10)(11)(12)(13)(14)(15)(16)(17)(18)(19)(20)(21)(22)(23)(24)(25). The results of the study support this hypothesis. The coaching sample and educator sample groups had extremely similar scores while the less educated sample of the general population at large show significantly higher scores in both measures of authoritarianism. On the basis of these findings, it may be concluded that the variable of coaching does not have a significant effect upon personality measures of authoritarianism when education is held constant.

-8

Confounding Variables

The scope of this study does not allow for a rigid control of all possible confounding variables in the sample groups. Four of the most noteworthy confounding variables were age, previous sports involvement, previous athletic coaching experiences in major team sports and athletic coaching experiences in other types of sport. Perfunctory judgement would question the validity of any conclusions based upon results obtained in the study, however a deeper and more thorough analysis of the variables and their actual relationships within subgroups and subparts of this study lends considerable support to the conclusions obtained.

Age:

Although Adorno *et al*. (1) and Rokeach (2) make no definite conclusions with respect to age and authoritarian scores, a cursory examination of the relationship between authoritarian scores and age in this study seems to point out the fact that authoritarianism varies directly with age (TABLE I). A further look at the authoritarian-age relationship reveals that this relationship is spurious. Although the mean scores of the entire sample groups show a direct relationship between age and authoritarianism (TABLE II), the individuals within the groups actually show a significant inverse relationship or an insignificant result with respect to the age-authoritarian relationship (TABLE IV).

TABLE IV

Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients of Age and Authoritarian Scores

	D - Age	F - Age
Coaches Sample Group	- .211	+ .327**
Educators Sample Group	- .381**	+ .131
General Population Sample Group	- .033	.98

* Significant at .01 level of confidence
** Significant at .05 level of confidence

Previous Sports Involvement:

Individual involvement with sports, either in past or present, was not rigidly controlled for in the sample groups. Although it was known that none of the two comparison groups were involved as coaches (at the time of writing) in the major team sports in Edmonton, there was no way of evaluating the effect an individual's involvement with sport may have had upon the scores. Although it is safe to assume that most of the individuals involved in the sample groups were exposed to participation in, and observation of sporting events, there was no method short of estimation based upon exhaustive interviews which would determine the duration, impact, or possible effects sport may have had upon the individual.

Another confounding variable similar to involvement with sport is involvement with physical education. Although it may be stated that this influence is minimal in all but the coaches sample group, the physical education background of the coaches may have had considerable effect upon the personality of the individuals involved, thus influencing the authoritarian scores. The physical education variable could possibly have mediated or modified the coaching variable as an independent variable. An examination of the data reveals that of the sixty-one coaches contacted, at least thirty-five (approximately fifty-eight percent) now teach physical education. This would point to a physical education background. The remaining forty-two percent may have been involved in physical education to a great extent previously, however this information is not evident. It can be safely stated that most of the coaches have a physical education background, albeit to varying degrees.

The influence upon the individual scores in all measures of authoritarianism by a physical education background cannot accurately be assessed by the data in this study. An analysis was made of authoritarian scores between physical education and non-physical education coaches presently teaching the subject and it was discovered that the group means and correlations were extremely similar. The non-physical education coaches had a mean score of 3.18 in the D Scale and 3.03 in the F Scale while the physical education coaches had means of 3.19 and 3.33 respectively. Although previous physical education backgrounds and sporting backgrounds were not controlled, the author feels justified (in spite of meagre statistical evidence) in accepting the conclusion that coaching does not vary with involvement in physical education, but is more dependent upon the general levels of education previously discussed.

Previous Athletic Coaching:

Although an attempt was made to measure the amounts of previous athletic coaching the coaches sample group had achieved, it was discovered that eight of the educator sample group (or twenty-five percent of the returned samples) actually had significant (at least two years) background in coaching major team sports. An analysis of these eight subject's scores in measures of authoritarianism in comparison with the group in which they were originally assigned, revealed that these eight scores closely approximated the mean of the educator group. The author therefore concluded that these scores would have little or no effect upon the sample groups involved.

Coaching Experience in Varied Sports:

It was noted that a number of respondents (including the coaches of major team sports) had coached a wide variety of individual and team sports. This is also a potentially confounding variable.

The educators sample group mentioned having coached track and field, soccer and volleyball most often. It was noted that these sports are sports which are quite commonly found within the school system. Three subjects also mentioned having coached hockey.

The sample group, composed of the general population of Edmonton males made mention of having coached hockey most frequently, followed by softball and baseball. It is interesting to note that none of these respondents ever coached more than two sports and had never coached one sport longer than two years. This is an extreme contrast to the coaching sample group and the educators sample group many of whom had coached a wide variety of sports for periods ranging up to ten years. The number of sports coached and the duration of the coaching role will be explored more fully at a later point in this study.

Secondary Problems

A. Secondary Problem:

Coaches have been judged as "authoritarians" based upon behaviour and/or attitude expressed while in the act of coaching. The author's purpose was to discover the relationship between a measure of these coaching behaviours and attitudes as assessed by the CAB Scale and measures of general authoritarianism as measured by the D Scale and right-wing authoritarianism as measured by the F Scale.

A Pearson Product Moment Correlation analysis reveals that there is a significant degree of relationship between scores obtained by coaches in respective personality measures of authoritarianism and coaching authoritarianism (TABLE V). There is also a significant relationship between the two personality measures of authoritarianism.

TABLE V

Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients Between Authoritarian Measures

	D Scale	F Scale	CAB Scale
D Scale	-		
F Scale	.527*	-	
CAB Scale	.606*	.742*	-

* Significant at the .01 level of confidence

Discussion

The significant correlations obtained between the two measures of authoritarianism and the scale measuring coaching authoritarianism indicates that coaches who score highly in the personality measures of authoritarianism may also be predicted to score highly in a measure of coaching attitude and behaviour. The Coaches Attitude-Behaviour Scale was a scale created by the author based upon examples of what has been termed "Authoritarian" coaching behaviour and attitudes (3)(4)(5)(26)(27)(28)(29)(30(31)(32)(33)(34)(35). Although the scale does not measure actual empirical coaching behaviour, the author must assume that attitudes expressed by the coaches in the questionnaire represent the individual's true feelings concerning the coaching role. The author must also assume that these attitudes become manifest and result in personal behaviour not only as described on the questionnaire, but also behaviour and habits which actually become manifest while in the coaching situation.

It must be mentioned that the extremely high degree of significance between F, D, and CAB Scales may in part be attributed to the problem of acquiescience response bias which was discussed in the methodological sections of this study. It is the author's belief that even if this response bias is not a characteristic of authoritarian personalities, the findings are too significantly high to be accounted for solely on the basis of the bias alone.

Although both the D and F Scales correlate significantly with the CAB Scale, it is noted that the F Scale has greater predictive powers than the D Scale. This may be interpreted as meaning that coaches who score highly in the Coaches Attitude-Behaviour Scale are more similar to the authoritarian personality as described by Adorno _et al_. (1) than the dogmatic individual described by Rokeach (2). Although both authoritarian descriptions have merit, the right wing authoritarian personality is more characteristic or more manifest in the high CAB scoring coach. As both Rokeach (2) and Adorno _et al_. (1) mention in their discussions of the authoritarian personality, an individual cannot be "pegholed" as simply falling into one or the other category, rather that personalities are composed of a multitude of variables, one of which is an authoritarian outlook. To extend this interpretation further, it may be possible to state, based upon the evidence in this study, that the coaching attitudes and behaviours expressed in the CAB Scale may be a manifestation of both general or dogmatic authoritarianism and right-wing ideological authoritarianism.

This hypothesis is supported in part by the high degree of relationship between F and D Scale scores as measured in all three sample groups (TABLE VI).

TABLE VI

Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients Between F and D Scale Scores for All Sample Groups

Coaches Sample Group	.527*
Educators Sample Group	.713*
General Population Sample Group	.498*

* Significant at the .01 level of confidence

Although acquiescient response bias may also affect the degree of significance between these scores, it is extremely possible that these two types of authoritarianism may exist either mutually or in combination with one another within the personality of any given individual.

B. Secondary Problem:

In an attempt to begin to differentiate between psychological and situational factors in coaching, various situational factors were analyzed in order to determine their relationship to the following: (a) Coaching Attitude-Behaviours, (b) general authoritarianism as measured by the D Scale, (c) right-wing authoritarianism as measured by the F Scale. The situational factors analyzed were: (i) age of coach, (ii) years of coaching experience, (iii) number of sports coached, (iv) ratio of players to coach.

Discussion

The previous discussions of authoritarian relationships in the sample of coaches attempted to explain the results by utilizing psychological theory. Although psychological theory is extremely useful and has merit in helping explain attitudes and behaviours originating from within the individual, situational factors or factors inherent within the coaching role or the sporting milieu could possibly exist which have an effect upon coaching personality. The situational factors could possibly create situations in which authoritarian behaviour permits the coach to function more efficiently (or is perceived to function more efficiently). Some of the measureable factors covered in the scope of this study are: (i) age of the coach, (ii) years of coaching experience, (iii) number of sports coached (iv) ratio of players to coach.

The measureable situational factors evident in major team sports in the City of Edmonton are easily observed (TABLE VII). It is noted that the mean age of the sample of coaches was 29.07 years. The range was from 24 to 43 years. Only one coach was above age 34. In comparison, it was noted that the age range for the educators sample group was from 26 to 62. In addition, the mean for this group was 34.34 years. The mean for the number of years experience in coaching was 6.40. This would indicate that most of the coaches in the school systems in Edmonton enter the ranks of coaching when they commence teaching. In addition to the number of years of coaching experience, the mean number of sports coached is 3.00. These figures are extremely similar to a related study done upon the workload of Alberta Physical Education Teachers (32).

TABLE VII

Means for Selected Situational Factors in the Coaches Sample Group

Age	Yrs. of Coaching	No. of Sports coached	Ratio of Players/ Coach
29.098	6.405	3.000	9.738

The relationship of these measures to measures of authoritarianism (F, D, and CAB Scales) is seen in TABLE VIII. Although the ratio of players to coach (part time coaches were given one-half coaching time compared to full time assistants) and the number of sports coached by any individual coach had no relationship upon any measure of authoritarianism; the age of the coach and the years of experience did have. It is noted that negative correlations between measures of authoritarianism and age exist and also negative correlations between years of coaching experience and the measures of authoritarianism. Many of these correlations are significant at the 5% level of confidence while some others approximate significance. It must be pointed out that since the relationship between years of coaching experience and the coaches age in extremely high and significant, the two variables will not be discussed separately but will henceforth be discussed as one variable.

TABLE VIII

Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients of Situational Factors in the Coaches Sample Group

	SITUATIONAL FACTORS			
	Age	Yrs. of coaching	No. of sports coached	Ratio players/coach
Authoritarian Measures				
D Scale	-.210	-.300**	.250	-.038
F Scale	-.317*	-.333*	.018	.005
CAB Scale	-.285**	-.282**	.082	-.148

* Significant at .05 level of confidence
** Close to significance at .05 level of confidence

POOR COPY

The negative relationship between the variables (especially the F Scale and CAB Scale) is confusing. It is generally felt that the older one's age, the more dogmatic, authoritative and prone to authoritarian submissiveness one would become. This would reflect in the F and D Scales and also the CAB Scale. This appears not to be the case in the coaches sample group nor as noted in the educators sample group (Table IV). Although any interpretation of the results for the coaches sample group can only be at a speculative level, it is possible that with increasing coaching years and under the sustained weight of three different teams to coach, the coach grows disinterested and becomes indifferent to his role as a coach. This "I don't care," or "I've had enough" could possibly reflect in a more relaxed coaching style, and possibly in these authoritative measures.

Other possible interpretations of the results (as discussed with coaches) could be based upon the fact that many coaches upon entering the coaching profession tend to emulate famous authoritarian coaches who have achieved a measure of success in terms of winning. It may be that as a coach becomes experienced (and older) his coaching style will become less authoritarian as he develops a coaching style of his own closer to his own personality needs. It may also be that a coach will change from an authoritative coaching style to a more democratic style

POOR COPY

if experience shows him that the latter is more effective in coaching. It is also possible to explain the results in terms of "coaching education."

As it has previously been noted, education has been shown to have an inverse relationship with the authoritarian measures. A parallel may be drawn between education and coaching experience since experience in coaching is actually a specific directed type of education. It may be hypothesized that as the "educational" level increases, authoritarianism decreases.

A final interpretation is based upon the nature of today's athlete. In previous years authoritarian coaching behaviours were accepted without question. The new breed of athlete who has recently emerged has been taught by the education system to ask questions and consequently this type of athlete begins to question sport itself and the authoritarian coaching technique. This is evident in the flood of sport "critiques" and is also evident in the problems which authoritarian coaches are experiencing today (20)(30). Realizing this, and also possibly affected by the overall philosophy itself, the whole coaching profession may be shifting towards a more "acceptable" i.e. non-authoritarian coaching style as judged by the norms of our new philosophy. This interpretation may also explain the vast differences found between degrees of coaching authoritarianism as hypothesized in

POOR COPY

the literature (much of which was published a number of years ago) and the results of this study.

Socialization and Cultural Factors

It is extremely probable that situational factors within the coaching profession are dependent upon socialization. Socialization is dependent upon the culture and the cultural emphasis which happen to exist at any given period in time. Much of the literature which defines, makes mention of, or illustrates authoritarian coaching behaviour, has originated in the United States of America. Although Canada and America are similar in many respects, the sporting culture in American society is extremely different to that of Canada's. It is the author's observation that these dissimilarities result in different patterns of sport socialization processes which consequently result in, among other things, a less dominant or authoritarian coach in the Canadian situation.

One of the noticeable cultural differences is in the philosophy of winning. The entire American philosophy is based upon a success-failure judgement criterian and this emphasis is reflected in its sporting culture. Success is judged in sports by the number of wins a team or individual attains as compared to losses. Although the judgement criterian is similar in Canadian sporting milieu, the sanction in psychological or materialistic terms are not nearly as severe as those in the United States. With reference to the American situation, it is easy to see that a coach's job as "skipper" of the team is a highly precarious one. This job can be classified as a "profession" in America and professional competence is estimated upon the relative degree of success. Since winning is very [illegible] of the coaches who do [illegible], while a majority of coaches are relieved of their duties. Coaching as a profession in Canada cannot as yet be termed a profession. This is in part due to the lack of recognition and prestige given by the Canadian public to the coaching position. As noted previously, the vast majority of coaches in Canada are engaged in full-time jobs other than coaching. Coaching in Canada has not yet achieved a level whereby many coaches are able to make a substantial living based entirely upon their earnings as a coach or the recognition associated with the job.

Another interesting aspect of the American-Canadian sporting situation is in the amount of dollars spent for sport in the United States is a multi-billion dollar business each year, whereas sport in Canada is not nearly as highly developed in comparison. With the amount of money involved in the United States, it is easy to see that the coaching position is an important focal point around which the sporting situation rotates.

The American culture is reflected in the type of games they play. Similarly, Canadian games are a microcosm of the Canadian culture and, to somewhat [illegible] the evidence [illegible] importance of [illegible] participating in [illegible] cultural variable [illegible] The [illegible] coaches [illegible] respect to [illegible] to the Canadian situations. The [illegible] have been explored and [illegible] explain the [illegible] in terms of [illegible] military or warlike [illegible] social mobility.

[illegible] of the [illegible] reasons behind the emphasis on sport, it can be seen that the coach in the United States has a relatively [illegible] prestigious and demanding position as compared to his counterpart in Canada. It is possible that these pressures, together with the insecurity that is inherent in the American coaching profession, leads the American coach to "take charge" and demand absolute control over certain coaching situations. If certain beliefs concerning the nature of authority and other theoretical constructs of authoritarianism have become socialized in the individual, the authoritarian coach could result. Although purely speculative in nature, it is widely believed in many [illegible] positions that in order to keep pace with and adequately function in the more dense American population, socialization has left the American character more [illegible], [illegible] and [illegible] forward. The Canadian character on the other hand, is often believed to be less dynamic, [illegible] [illegible], [illegible], and fearful of risk [illegible] leaving the "middle of the road". If in fact this speculation is valid, the authoritarian dimension in American coaches is a function of socialization [illegible] and [illegible] due to the coaching variable itself.

An alternative interpretation of the dichotomy between the [illegible] and the results of this study can be posed by speculating that American coaches are significantly better trained than their Canadian counterparts. Although American coaches are not always qualified as teachers (as are most Canadian coaches in the school system) the author is not able to accept the interpretation on the grounds of insufficient data.

The Canadian coach has a unique role. With the exception of the coaches of professional teams (most of whom are American) and coaches of the "amateur" junior hockey teams, the vast majority of Canadian coaches are either volunteers (as in little leagues etc.) or, as examined in this study, are "volunteer" coaches within the school systems. Often this "volunteer" job is a non-financial condition of employment. In addition to being unrecognized and unrewarded financially, the coach in Canada often receives little or no specific "on the job" training, but is often thrust into the head coaching position as soon as he is available. The lack of coaches, particularly in the secondary school system, gives little opportunity for a "newcomer" to be an assistant coach for a period of years, but [illegible] almost immediately a head coach. The lack of coaches is due partly to the lack of prestige in the position and partly to the lack of financial reward. Other factors are evident. The Canadian coach often coaches many different sports. Often these seasons overlap. Therefore the amount of time a coach must spend at practices and during preparation and evaluation of the practices mounts rapidly and even some of the most enthusiastic coaches only remain a few years. As was illustrated by the data on the sample, the mean age of the coach in major team sports in Edmonton, Alberta, Canada, was twenty-nine years while only one coach was over thirty-four. This would show that many coaches are leaving the coaching position after only a few years. Related to this fact that over such a short period of time in coaching with more than one sport to coach, the Canadian coach has little time to develop expertise in any given sport. Perhaps this partially accounts for Canada's relative lack of expert coaches and high calibre of play.

Since the Canadian coach is sometimes thrust into a head coaching position almost immediately, he often coaches teams without the aid of an assistant. Assistant coaches are relatively scarce in Canada and therefore the ratio of players to coach is usually quite high. This leads to an added burden on preparation and conduction of practices and games and could lead to frustration on the coach's part and a poorer quality of play in the sport itself.

Although there are many adequate practices in Canadian sport, many improvements could be made, especially in the area of secondary school coaching. If sport is justified as being within the scope of the educational system, then efforts should be made to continually upgrade the calibre of sport itself as a product of an educational experience and the overseer of this experience, the educator - coach.

REFERENCES

1. Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D.J. and Sanford, R. N. The Authoritarian Personality. New York: Harper & Row, [illegible], 1950.

2. Rokeach, Milton. The Open and Closed Mind. New York: Basic Books, Inc., [illegible].

3. [illegible] The Psychology of Character. [illegible]

4. [illegible] and [illegible], T. [illegible]. [illegible] Press, 19[illegible].

5. [illegible], E. The [illegible]. New York: The Free Press, 19[illegible].

6. Brown, Roger. Social Psychology. New York: The Free Press, 19[illegible].

7. Hyman, H. H. and Sheatsley, Paul B. "'The Authoritarian Personality' - A Methodological Critique," in Studies in the Scope and Method of the Authoritarian Personality, edited by R. Christie and M. Jahoda. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1954.

8. MacKinnon, W. J. and Centers, R. "Authoritarianism and Urban Stratification." American Journal of Sociology, 61, [illegible] 1956.

9. Kornhauser, A., Sheppard, H. L. and Mayer, A. J. When Labor Votes. New York: University Books, 1956.

10. Cohn, T. S. and Carsch, H. "Administration of the F Scale to a Sample of Germans." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 49, 1954, 471.

11. Jacobson, F. N. and Rettig, S. "Authoritarianism and Intelligence." The Journal of Social Psychology, 50, 1959, 213-219.

12. McDill, E. L. "Anomie, Authoritarianism, Prejudice, and Socio-economic Status: An Attempt at Clarification." Social Forces, 39, 1961, 239-245.

13. Roberts, A. H. and Rokeach, M. "Anomie, Authoritarianism, and Prejudice: A Replication." American Journal of Sociology, 61, (1956), 355-358.

14. Srole, L. "Social Integration and Certain Corollaries: An Exploratory Study." American Sociological Review, 21, (1956), 709-716.

15. Christie, R. and Jahoda, M. (Editors), Studies in the Scope and Method of "The Authoritarian Personality." Glencoe: The Free Press.

16. Lipset, S. M. Political Man. New York: Doubleday, (1960).

17. Lipset, S. M. "Democracy and Working Class Authoritarianism." American Sociological Review, 24, (1959), 482-502.

18. Lipsitz, L. "Working Class Authoritarianism: A Re-evaluation." American Sociological Review, 30, (1965), 103-109.

19. Lichtenstein, E., Quinn, R. P. and Hover, G. C. "Dogmatism and Acquiescent Response Set." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 63, (1961), 636-638.

20. Kerlinger, F. and Rokeach, M. "The Factorial Nature of the F and D Scales." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 4, (1966), 391-399.

21. Fruchter, B., Rokeach, M. and Novak, E. "A Factorial Study of Dogmatism, Opinionation and Related Scales." Psychological Reports, 4, (1958), 19-22.

22. Hanson, D. J. "Dogmatism and Authoritarianism." The Journal of Social Psychology, 76, (1968), 89-95.

23. Plant, W. T. "Rokeach's Dogmatism Scale as a Measure of General Authoritarianism." Psychological Reports, 6, (1960), 164.

24. Rokeach, M. and Fruchter, B. "A Factorial Study of Dogmatism and Related Concepts." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 53, (1956), 356-360.

25. Rokeach, M. "Political and Religious Dogmatism: An Alternative to the Authoritarian Personality," Psychological Monographs, 70, (1956); no. 18.

26. Underwood, John. "The Desperate Coach." Sports Illustrated, August 25, 1969, 67-76; September 1, 1969, 20-27; September 8, 1969, 28-40.

27. Rafferty, M. "[illegible] Athletics: The Crisis in Sport," in Scott, J. The Athletic Revolution. New York: The Free Press, (1971).

28. Wolf, David. Foul! The Connie Hawkins Story. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, (1972).

29. Conacher, Brian. Hockey in Canada: The Way It Is! Toronto: Gateway Press Limited, (1970).

30. Barnes, LaVerne. The Plastic Orchard. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, (1971).

31. Dowling, Tom. Coach: A Season With Lombardi. New York: Popular Library, (19[illegible]).

32. Kramer, Jerry. Instant Replay: The Green Bay Diary of Jerry Kramer. Edited by Dick Schaap. Toronto: The New American Library of Canada Limited, (1969).

33. Shecter, Leonard. The Jocks. New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., (1969).

34. Hoch, Paul. Rip Off The Big Game: The Exploitation of Sports by the Power Elite. Garden City: Doubleday & Company, Inc., (1972).

35. Parrish, Bernie. They Call It A Game. New York: Dial Press, (1971).

36. Meggyesy, Dave. Out of Their League. Berkeley: Ramparts Press, Inc., (1971)

37. Eurchuk, M. "A Study of the Workload of Alberta Physical Education Teachers." Unpublished paper, University of Alberta, Edmonton, June, 1973.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

7

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine the validity of the proposition that the "authoritarian" personality type is quite pronounced in teachers as compared to the [illegible] [illegible]. The [illegible] of [illegible], based upon concepts [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] were explored. One hundred and six subjects were pre-selected and placed into three sample groups. The teacher sample group consisted of forty-two teachers of [illegible] [illegible] from the City of Edmonton. Two groups of thirty-two members each were created in order to control the confounding variable of education. One group consisted of a random sample of educators employed by the Public and Separate School Boards in the City of Edmonton, while a third sample group consisted of a random sample of males from the general population of Edmonton. All sample groups were asked to complete a questionnaire which included a D Scale measuring general authoritarianism and an F Scale measuring right-wing authoritarianism. In addition to the F and D Scales, all groups were asked to complete a short general information sheet. The coaching group was also asked to complete a Coaches Attitude-Behaviour (CAB) Scale. This scale was prepared by the author in order to[1] measure attitudes and behaviour which typically are attributed to an authoritarian coach.

A secondary problem of the study was to examine the relationship between the personality variables of authoritarianism and dogmatism among coaches (as measured by the two Scales) in order to determine if authoritarianism in coaching behaviour was a manifestation of a more general authoritarian personality syndrome. To this end, the relationships between the F and D Scales, and the CAB Scale were all analysed for members of the coaching sample group.

Another secondary problem explored the situational factors evident in the coaching of major team sports in the secondary school systems in the City of Kingston. This dimension was explored in an attempt to begin to differentiate between psychological and situational factors which might contribute to authoritarianism in coaches. The findings were expanded into a discussion which included cultural factors and socialization process as it related to coaches in an effort to explain the findings in light of previous contradictory results in the United States.

Results

The results of the study do not support the literature which claims coaches, as a group, measure extremely high in "authoritarianism". Statistical results showed that of all sample groups tested, the coaching sample group scored significantly lower in authoritarianism as compared to the sample of the general population of males in Edmonton. The educator sample group had scores which closely approximated those of the coaching sample group in these authoritarian measures. The author concluded on the basis of the results in this study, that coaches as a group, in the major team sports of football and basketball in Edmonton, Alberta, Canada, are not highly authoritarian in measures of general and right-wing authoritarianism.

Although confounding variables such as age, involvement in physical education, and previous involvement in sport, were briefly considered, the author concludes that the general level of education seemed to have a more significant effect upon the authoritarian measures examined than the other variables.

An analysis of the relationship between the authoritarian scores and scores obtained by the coaching sample group in a measure of specific authoritarian coaching attitude and behaviour, revealed that coaches who score highly in the personality authoritarian measures also score highly in the specific coaching authoritarian measure. Of the two authoritarian scales, right-wing authoritarianism (as measured by the F Scale) was more predictive of specific coaching authoritarianism than the D Scale which measured general authoritarianism. Although both scales correlated highly with the coaches authoritarian scale, the right-wing authoritarian personality can be said to be more characteristic or more manifest in the coach who exhibits attitudes and behaviors in the coaching role which are commonly thought to be authoritarian. In light of the significant relationships found between all scales, the author also concluded that the coaching attitudes and behaviors expressed in the CAS Scale may be a manifestation of both general and right-wing authoritarianism.

In an attempt to begin to differentiate between psychological and situational factors in coaching, several measureable situational factors were analyzed in respect to their relationship with all authoritarian scores. The factors explored were: (i) age of the coach, (ii) years of coaching experience, (iii) number of sports coached, and (iv) ratio of players to coach.

It was discovered that the age of the coach and the number of years of coaching experience were highly related. These variables both showed inverse relationships with all authoritarian measures. Several of these relationships were significant at the .05 level of confidence while several approached significance. Although interpretation of these results could only be classed as speculation, the author felt that as a coach gains experience, his coaching style could become more democratic. This could occur as a result of an increased indifference to the coaching role, possibly as a result of the coach's heavy workload as characterized by a high ratio of players to coach, and the number of different sports coached. An alternate interpretation was based upon the concept that inexperienced coaches tend to emulate successful authoritarian coaches. It may be that as the individual gains experience, he will lose this tendency and develop a coaching style more suitable to his personality needs.

It is also possible to equate education and coaching experience. The end result of an increased education level as noted earlier was lower authoritarian scores.

A final interpretation was made with respect to the philosophic shift of cultural values which has occurred in the past few years. It is possible that the whole coaching profession, recognizing the values of the new philosophy as they gain experience, may have shifted to a more "acceptable" style of coaching as judged by the new norms.

In light of the findings of this study, cultural factors and the socialization process as it relates to coaching were discussed in order to partially account for the differences found between the results of this study and the literature originating in the United States. The emphasis upon winning and the nature of sport as big business in America contrasted sharply with the sporting emphasis in Canada. The author concluded that these factors (and several others arising from these), created socialization differences and expectations which could account for the contrasting conclusions concerning authoritarianism in coaches.

Recommendations.

The following are a number of recommendations based upon the results of this study and the evident lack of knowledge concerning the nature of authoritarianism and authoritarian coaches.

1. The concept of authoritarianism be defined and unified in sport and in personality theory.
2. A standardized scale be created in specific measures of coaching authoritarianism based upon defined coaching authoritarianism.
3. A study be carried out comparing a variety of alternative authoritarian personality measures to

"authoritarian" coaches in order to further delineate characteristics of the authoritarian coach.

4. Authoritarian coaching behaviour be empirically evaluated by direct observation and compared to written authoritarian scores.
5. Coaches in the United States and Canada be compared in regards of coaching authoritarianism and personality authoritarianism in order to discover whether or not actual differences occur in regards of authoritarianism.
6. Coaches of individual sports, minor team sports, and sports which are outside school jurisdiction be measured in authoritarianism and be compared to coaches of major team sports in order to further examine situational factors which may be evident.
7. A study be carried out to compare and contrast professional coaches' authoritarian scores with scores of coaches at the amateur level.
8. A study be carried out to compare and contrast authoritarian scores between similar coaches of different cultures in order to further determine cultural and situational factors which may be evident.
9. A study similar to the study undertaken by this author be conducted in other centers across Canada in order to determine whether or not geographic setting has an effect upon all aspects of authoritarianism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Amdur, Neil. The Fifth Down: Democracy and the Football Revolution. New York: Coward, McCann & Geoghegan, Inc. 1971.

Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J. and Sanford, R. N. [illegible] New York: Harper & Row, [illegible] 1950.

Barker, Edwin N. "Authoritarianism of the Political Right, Center and Left." [illegible] 1958.

Barnes, [illegible] Toronto: [illegible]

Bass, B. M. "Authoritarianism or Acquiescence?" Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 51. 1955.

Berkowitz, N. H. and Wolkon, G. H. "A Forced Choice Form of the F Scale—Free of Acquiescent Response Set." Sociometry, 27, 54-65. 1964.

Brown, Roger. Social Psychology. New York: The Free Press. 1965.

Chapman, L. J. and Campbell, D. T. "Response Set in the F Scale." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 54, 129-132. 1957.

Christie, R. "Authoritarianism Re-examined," in Studies in the Scope and Method of the Authoritarian Personality. Edited by R. Christie and M. Jahoda. Glencoe: The Free Press. 1954.

Christie, R., Havel, Joan and Seidenberg, B. "Is the F Scale Irreversible?" Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 56, 143-159. 1958.

Christie, R. and Jahoda, M. (editors). Studies in the Scope and Method of the Authoritarian Personality. Glencoe: The Free Press. 1954.

Cohn, T. S. "The Relation of the F Scale to a Response to Answer Positively." American Psychologist, 8, 335. 1953.

Cohn, T. S. and Carsh, H. "Administration of the F Scale to a Sample of Germans." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 49, 471. 1954.

Conacher, Brian. Hockey In Canada: The Way It Is! Toronto: Gateway Press Limited. 1970.

Couch, A. and Keniston, K. "Yeasayers and Naysayers: Agreeing Response Set as a Personality Variable." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 60, 151-174. 1960.

Coulter, Thelma. "An Experimental and Statistical Study of the Relationship of Prejudice and Certain Personality Variables." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of London. 1953.

Cronbach, L. J. "Response Sets and Test Validity." Educational Psychology Measurement, 6, 475-494. 1946.

Department of Scientific Research of the American Jewish Committee. 5 Item F Scale. Unpublished Scale.

Dowling, Tom. Coach: A Season With Lombardi. New York: Popular Library. 1970.

Eurchuk, N. "A Study of the Workload of Alberta Physical Education Teachers." Unpublished Paper, University of Alberta, June, 1972.

Eysenck, H. J. The Psychology of Politics. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul. 1954.

Fromm, Erich. Escape From Freedom. New York: Farrar & Rinehart, Inc. 1941.

Frupter, R., Rokeach, M. and Novak, E. "A Factorial Study of Dogmatism, Opinionation and Related Scales." Psychological Reports, 4, 19-22. 1958.

Gage, N. L., Leavitt, G. S. and Stone, G. C. "The Psychological Meaning of Acquiescience Set in Authoritarianism." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 55, 98-103. 1957.

Hanson, D. J. "Dogmatism and Authoritarianism." The Journal of Social Psychology, 76, 89-95. 1968.

Hoch, Paul. Rip Off The Big Game: The Exploitation of Sports by the Power Elite. Garden City: Doubleday & Company, Inc. 1972.

Hyman, H. H. and Sheatsley, Paul B. "'The Authoritarian Personality' – A Methodological Critique." In Studies in the Scope and Method of the Authoritarian Personality. Edited by R. Christie and M. Jahoda. Glencoe: The Free Press. 1954.

Jackson, D. N. and Messick, S. J. "A Note on 'Ethnocentrism' and Acquiescence Response Set." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 40, 215-221. 1957.

Kerlinger, F. and Rokeach, M. "The Factorial Nature of the F and D Scales." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 4, 391-399. 1966.

Kirscht, J. P. and Dillehay. Dimensions of Authoritarianism: A Review of Research and Theory. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press. 1967.

Klein, F. D. "A Factorial Analysis of the F and the Reversed F Scale in 3 Recidivist Samples." Journal of Social Psychology, 65, 127-134. 1965.

Kornhauser, A., Sheppard, H. L. and Mayer, A. J. When Labor Votes. New York: University Books. 1956.

Kramer, Jerry. Instant Replay: The Green Bay Diary of Jerry Kramer. Edited by Dick Schaap. Toronto: The New American Library of Canada, Limited. 1969.

Leavitt, H. J., Hax, H. and Roche, J. H. "'Authoritarianism' and Agreement with Things Authoritative." Journal of Psychology, 40, 215-221. 1955.

Lichtenstein, D., Quinn, R. R. and Hover, G. C. "Dogmatism and Acquiescience Response Set." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 63, 636-638. 1961.

Lipset, S. M. "Democracy and Working Class Authoritarianism." American Sociological Review, 24, 482-501. 1959.

Lipset, S. M. Political Man. New York: Doubleday. 1960.

Lipsitz, L. "Working Class Authoritarianism: A Re-evaluation." *American Sociological Review*, 30, 103-109. 1965.

MacKinnon, W. J. and Centers, R. "Authoritarian and Urban Stratification." *American Journal of Sociology*, 61, 610-620. 1956.

Maslow, A. H. "The Authoritarian Character Structure." *The Journal of Social Psychology*. S.P.S.S.I. Bulletin, 18, 401-411. 1943.

McDill, E. L. "Anomie, Authoritarianism, Prejudice, and Socioeconomic Status: An Attempt at Clarification." *Social Forces*, 39, 239-245. 1961.

Meggyesy, Dave. *Out of Their League*. Berkeley: Ramparts Press, Inc. 1971.

Melvin, D. "An Experimental and Statistical Study of Two Primary Social Attitudes." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of London. 1955.

Millon, T. A. "Intolerance of Ambiguity and Rigidity Under Ego and Task Involving Conditions." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 55, 29-33. 1957.

Ogilvie, Bruce C. and Tutko, T. *Problem Athletes and How to Handle Them*. London: Pelham Books. 1966.

Parrish, Bernie. *They Call It A Game*. New York: Dial Press. 1971.

Plant, W. T. "Rokeach's Dogmatism Scale as a Measure of General Authoritarianism." *Psychological Reports*, 6, 164. 1960.

Powell, F. A. and Troldahl, V. C. "A Short-Form Dogmatism Scale for Use in Field Studies." *Social Forces*, 44, 211-215. 1965.

Rafferty, Max. "Intercollegiate Athletics: The Gathering Storm," in Scott, J. *The Athletic Revolution*. New York: The Free Press. 1971.

Richards, J. and Tutko, T. *The Psychology of Coaching*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon. 1971.

Roberts, A. H. and Rokeach, M. "Anomie, Authoritarianism, and Prejudice: A Replication." *American Journal of Sociology*, 61, 355-358. 1956.

Rokeach, M. "Political and Religious Dogmatism: An Alternative to the Authoritarian Personality." *Psychological Monographs*, 70, no. 18. 1956.

Rokeach, Milton. *The Open and Closed Mind*. New York: Basic Books, Inc. 1960.

Rokeach, M. and Fruchter, B. "A Factorial Study of Dogmatism and Related Concepts." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 53, 356-360. 1956.

Sanford, F. H. and Older, H. J. A Short Authoritarian Equalitarian Scale. Philadelphia: Institute for Research in Human Relations. 1950.

Schulze, Rolf H. K. "A Shortened Version of the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale." *Journal of Psychological Studies*, 13, 93-97. 1962.

Scott, J. *The Athletic Revolution*. New York: The Free Press. 1971.

Shecter, Leonard. *The Jocks*. New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc. 1969.

Shils, Edward A. "Authoritarianism: 'Right' and 'Left'," in *Studies in the Scope and Method of the Authoritarian Personality*. Edited by R. Christie and M. Jahoda. Glencoe: The Free Press. 1954.

Srole, L. "Social Integration and Certain Corollaries: An Exploratory Study." *American Sociological Review*, 21, 709-716. 1956.

Stagner, R. "Fascist Attitudes: An Exploratory Study." *Journal of Social Psychology*, 7, 309-319. 1936.

Steiner, I. and Johnson, H. Authoritarianism and Conformity." *Sociometry*, 26, 21-34. 1963.

Stewart, D. and Hoult, T. "A Social Psychological Theory of the Authoritarian Personality." *American Journal of Sociology*, 65, 274-279. 1959.

Strickland, L. H. and Janicki, W. P. "An Alternative Form of Forced Choice F Scale." *Psychological Reports*, 16, 93[illegible]. 1965.

Underwood, John. "The Desperate Coach," *Sports Illustrated*, August 2[illegible], 1969, 6[illegible]; September 1, 1969, 20-27; September 8, 1969, 28-40.

Wolf, David. *Foul! The Connie Hawkins Story*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. 1972.

APPENDIX A

INTRODUCTORY LETTER TO COACHES

division of athletics

FACULTY of PHYSICAL EDUCATION
the university of alberta ● edmonton, canada

May 28, 1973

Dear

I am presently involved in a research project at the University of Alberta, designed to explore the general personality of coaches here in Edmonton. I would like to solicit your time and cooperation in this research.

In a few days I will send you a packet containing two questionnaires. When you find time within the next week or so, I would ask you to complete the questionnaire and return it to me in the stamped self-addressed envelope. The total time involved should be less than one-half hour.

I would like to thank you in advance for helping me with a project which I feel may be extremely valuable and could tell us more about ourselves.

Yours in coaching,

Bob Bain
Head Basketball Coach

BB/sp

home of the golden bears and pandas

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE COVERING LETTER TO COACHES

division of athletics

FACULTY of PHYSICAL EDUCATION
the university of alberta ● edmonton, canada

May 31, 1973

Dear Coach:

Please find enclosed a questionnaire concerning beliefs with which you may agree or disagree. As I mentioned in my previous letter, I would greatly appreciate it if you can take time out from your schedule and aid me in a research project which may have important ramifications.

A short information sheet is included as are complete instructions to the questionnaire.

Yours sincerely,

Bob Bain

Bob Bain

BB/sp
Enclosure

home of the golden bears and pandas

APPENDIX C

GENERAL INFORMATION SHEET FOR COACHES

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Sport Coached ____________________ level ____________________

2. Number of players on team _____ Average Age of Players _____

3. Number of full-time assistants _____ Part-time assistants ___

4. Do you have an academic degree? Yes ☐ No ☐

5. Did you receive the majority of your education in Canada

   Yes ☐ No ☐

   If no, please state country education occurred ______________

6. Number of years involved in any type of coaching ____________

7. State sport other than listed in #1 above that you have coached.

SPORT	YEARS COACHED
______________________________	______________
______________________________	______________
______________________________	______________

8. Age in years ___________

APPENDIX D

THE COACHES ATTITUDE-BEHAVIOUR SCALE

INSTRUCTIONS

The following statements are based upon situations and specific problems with which coaches sometimes must concern themselves. The best answer to each statement is your personal choice. I have tried to cover a wide variety of coaching questions. You may find yourself agreeing strongly with some of the statements, disagreeing just as strongly with others, and perhaps uncertain about others; whether you agree or disagree with any statement, you can be sure that many coaches feel the same as you do. Please base you opinions upon your feelings and your actual behavior with respect to your coaching experiences.

Mark each statement in the left margin according to how much you agree or disagree with it. Please mark every one. Write +1, +2, +3, or -1, -2, -3, depending on how you feel in each case.

+1	I agree a little	-1	I disagree a little
+2	I agree on the whole	-2	I disagree on the whole
+3	I agree very much	-3	I disagree very much

1. It is best to maintain a large social distance from the players in order to maintain a high level of authority.

2. Coaches should be concerned with discovering the individual athletes who violate team or social rules.

3. The players should always realize that coaches are the boss whether or not they are right and their decisions or regulations should never be questioned.

4. The coach has the right to set all rules and regulations and anyone who violates these rules must be disciplined.

5. The coach has enough problems trying to achieve a high performance level from his athletes and should not overly concern himself with an individual athlete's problems.

6. Players should report all grievances to the captain of the team in order that he may report them to the coach.

7. The best way to eliminate mistakes is to make the players do pushups, laps or any form of physical exercise so that he will remember his mistakes and won't make them again.

8. Most players are motivated by threats of punishment such as laps, push-ups, etc.

9. Players are motivated by threats of demotion or of expulsion from the team.

10. Disciplinary action taken by the coach is easier and handled better if the players involved are not personally close to the coach.

11. Coaches should get to know their players slightly, but should not become friendly or warm with them.

12. Players should realize that the coach knows more than they do in the particular sport and should never ask "why?"

13. A well disciplined team on and off the playing field or court usually has better performance record.

14. A well disciplined team makes the coach look better to the community at large.

15. A rigid formal relationship with an athlete on and off the court should be one of the methods used by coaches to maintain respect and jurisdiction a coach deserves and needs in order to best perform his duties as coach.

16. A coach who is too friendly with his players and does not remain somewhat detached from them is apt to lose his position of influence over the athlete.

17. A coach should always keep his over all won-lost record in mind in order to see if his athletes view him as successful or not.

18. Coaches and Athletic administrators should continually be aware of those who are attempting to undermine the system of athletics whether they are athletes or not.

19. Those individual athletes who attempt to disrupt the athletic system must be punished or "put down" by any acceptable method if available.

20. A coach should refrain from taking extreme positions in any aspect of social or professional behavior because he must set a conservative example to his players and to other coaches.

21. A coach should organize himself to the point that there can be absolutely no question in his mind or his athletes' minds about what is occurring whether it be during a game, during practice, or during a road trip.

22. Athletes recognize the position of authority of the coach and respond to forceful and direct criticism or threat of criticism in a desired direction.

23. Discipline in athletics helps create model ~~citizens or at the~~ least helps develop individuals to take meaningful and worthwhile positions in society.

24. If more people would participate in athletics, they would be better able to discipline themselves in everyday life because of discipline they receive in sport.

25. Players should not be encouraged to come and talk to the coach about problems in the offense or defense because this is the coaches concern. The athlete should be concerned with perfecting his techniques within the system.

APPENDIX E

THE QUESTIONNAIRE INCLUDING F AND D SCALES

INSTRUCTIONS

The following is a study of what the general public thinks and feels about a number of important social and personal questions. The best answer to each statement below is your PERSONAL OPINION. I have tried to cover many different and opposing points of view; you may find yourself agreeing strongly with some of the statements, disagreeing just as strongly with others, and perhaps uncertain about others; whether you agree or disagree with any statement, you can be sure that many people feel the same as you do.

Mark each statement in the left margin according to how much you agree or disagree with it. Please mark every one. Write +1, +2, +3 or -1, -2, -3, depending on how you feel in each case.

+1: I agree a little
+2: I agree on the whole
+3: I agree very much

-1 I disagree a little
-2 I disagree on the whole
-3 I disagree very much

1. The United States and Russia have just about nothing in common.

2. The highest form of government is a democracy and the highest form of democracy is a government run by those who are most intelligent.

3. Even though freedom of speech, for all groups is a worthwhile goal, it is unfortunately necessary to restrict freedom of certain political groups.

4. It is only natural that a person would have a much better acquaintance with ideas he believes in than with ideas he opposes.

5. Man on his own is a helpless and miserable creature.

6. Fundamentally, the world we live in is a pretty lonesome place.

7. Most people just don't give a "damn" for others.

8. I'd like it if I could find someonw who would tell me now to solve my personal problems.

9. It is only natural for a person to be rather fearful of the future.

10. There is so much to be done and so little time to do it in.

11. Once I get wound up in a heated discussion, I just can't stop.

12. In a discussion, I often find it necessary to repeat myself several times to make sure I am being understood.

13. In a heated discussion, I generally become so absorbed in what I am going to say, I forget to listen to what the others are saying.

14. It is better to be a dead hero than a live coward.

15. While I don't like to admit this even to myself, my secret ambition is to become a great man, like Einstein, or Beethovan, or Shakespeare.

16. The main thing in life is for a person to want to do something important.

17. If given the chance, I would do something of great benefit to the world.

18. In the history of mankind, there have probably been just a handful of really great thinkers.

19. There are a number of people I have come to hate because of the things they stand for.

20. A man who does not believe in some great cause has not really lived.

21. It is only when a person devotes himself to an ideal or cause that life becomes meaningful.

22. Of all the different philosophies which exist in this world, there is probably only one which is correct.

23. A person who gets enthusiastic about too many causes is likely to be a pretty "wishy-washy" sort of person.

24. To compromise with our political opponents is dangerous because it usually leads to betrayal of our side.

25. When it comes to differences of opinion in religion, we must be careful not to compromise with those who believe differently from the way we do.

26. In times like these, a person must be pretty selfish if he considers primarily his own happiness.

27. The worst crime a person could commit is to attack publicly the people who believe in the same thing he does.

28. In times like these, it is often necessary to be more on guard against ideas put out by people in one's own camp than by those in the opposing camp.

29. A group which tolerates too much differences of opinion among its own members cannot exist for long.

30. There are two kinds of people in the world: those who are for the truth and those who are against the truth.

31. My blood boils whenever a person stubbornly refuses to admit he's wrong.

32. A person who thinks primarily of his own happiness is beneath contempt.

33. Most of the ideas which get printed nowadays aren't worth the paper they are printed on.

34. In this complicated world of ours, the only way we can know what's going on is to rely on leaders or experts who can be trusted.

35. It is often desirable to reserve judgment about what's going on until one has a chance to hear the opinions of those one respects.

36. In the long run, the best way to live is to pick friends and associates whose tastes and beliefs are the same as one's own.

37. The present is all too often full of unhappiness. It is only the future that counts.

38. If a man is to accomplish his mission in life, it is sometimes necessary to gamble "all or nothing at all."

39. Unfortunately, a good many people with whom I have discussed important social and moral problems don't really understand what is going on.

40. Most people don't know what is good for them.

41. Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn.

42. A person who has bad manners, habits and breeding can hardly expect to get along with decent people.

43. If people would talk less and work more, everybody would be better off.

44. The businessman and the manufacturer are much more important to society than the artist and the professor.

45. Science has its place, but there are many more important things that can never possibly be understood by the human mind.

46. Young people sometimes get rebellious ideas, but as they grow up they ought to get over them and settle down.

47. What this country needs most, more than laws and political programs, is a few courageous, tireless, devoted leaders in whom the people can put their faith.

48. No sane, normal, decent person could ever think of hurting a close friend or relative.

49. Nobody ever learned anything really important except through suffering.

50. What the youth needs is strict discipline, rugged determination and the will to work and fight for family and country.

51. An insult to our honor should always be punished.

52. Sex crimes, such as rape and attacks on children deserve more than mere imprisonment; such criminals ought to be publicly whipped, or worse.

53. There is hardly anything lower than a person who does not feel a great love, gratitude, and respect for his parents.

54. Most of our social problems would be solved if we could somehow get rid of the immoral, crooked, and feebleminded people.

55. Homosexuals are hardly better than criminals and ought to be severely punished.

56. When a person has a problem to worry, it is best for him not to think about it, but to keep busy with more cheerful things.

57. Every person should have complete faith in some supernatural power whose decisions he obeys without question.

58. Some people are born with an urge to jump from high places.

59. Some day it will probably be shown that astrology can explain a lot of things.

60. People can be divided into two distinct classes: the weak and the strong.

61. Wars and social trouble may someday be ended by an earthquake or flood that will destroy the whole world.

62. No weakness or difficulty can hold us back if we have enough will power.

63. Most people don't realize how much our lives are controlled by plots hatched in secret places.

64. Human nature being what it is, there will always be war and conflict.

65. Familiarity breeds contempt.

66. Nowadays when so many different kinds of people move around and mix together so much, a person has to protect himself especially carefully against catching an infection or disease from them.

67. Nowadays more and more people are prying into matters that should remain personal and private.

68. The wild sex life of the old Greeks and Romans was tame compared to some of the goings-on in this country, even in places where people might least expect it.

APPENDIX F

FOLLOW UP LETTER TO COACHES AND EDUCATORS

division of athletics

FACULTY of PHYSICAL EDUCATION
the university of alberta ● edmonton, canada

June 20, 1973

Dear Coach:

Some time has elapsed since I first sent you a questionnaire designed to answer some important questions with respect to coaching personalities.

If you have completed the questionnaire and have returned it to me, I extend my thanks. If you have still to complete the questionnaire, I would ask you to do so when you are able to find time out from your schedule.

Thanks once again.

Bob Bain

Bob Bain
Head Basketball Coach

BB/sp

home of the golden bears and pandas

APPENDIX G

THANK YOU LETTER TO COACHES AND EDUCATORS

August 1, 1973

Dear

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your cooperation in aiding me complete research here at the University of Alberta.

You may be interested to know that the research project was concerned with measures of authoritarianism, specifically as it relates to coaches in Edmonton. I have included a brief abstract of the study for your interest. The completed study is available in thesis form at the Physical Education Library on the University of Alberta campus if you should wish to read further.

Thank you once again,

Bob Bain

RB/sp

APPENDIX H

INTRODUCTORY LETTER SENT TO EDUCATORS

FACULTY OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION
THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
EDMONTON, ALBERTA, CANADA T6G 2H9

DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION

June 1, 1973

Dear Sir:

I am presently involved in a research project at the University of Alberta. This project is designed to explore the thoughts and beliefs of the men who live in Edmonton. I would like to solicit your time and cooperation in this project.

In a few days, I will send you a packet containing a questionnaire. When you find time within the following week, I would ask that you complete the questionnaire as instructed and return it to me in the stamped, self addressed envelope. The total time involved should be less than one-half hour.

I would like to thank you in advance for helping me with my project. I feel it could be extremely valuable research and may help to tell us something about our beliefs.

Yours truly,

R. B. Bain

RBB/sp

APPENDIX I

QUESTIONNAIRE COVERING LETTER TO EDUCATORS

FACULTY OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION
THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
EDMONTON, ALBERTA, CANADA T6G 2H9

DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION

Dear Sir:

Please find enclosed a questionnaire concerning beliefs with which you may agree or disagree. As I mentioned in my previous letter, I would greatly appreciate it if you can take time out from your schedule and aid me in a research project which may have important ramifications.

A short information sheet is included as are complete instructions to the questionnaire.

Yours sincerely,

Bob Bain

Bob Bain

BB/sp

APPENDIX J

INTRODUCTORY LETTER SENT TO THE SELECTED MEMBERS OF THE POPULATION

FACULTY OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
EDMONTON 7, CANADA

June 4, 1973

Dear Sir:

I am presently involved in a research project at the University of Alberta. This project is designed to explore the thoughts and beliefs of the men who live in Edmonton. I would like to solicit your time and cooperation in this project.

Please find enclosed a questionnaire concerning beliefs with which you may agree or disagree. I would greatly appreciate if you could take time out from your schedule in order to complete the questionnaire as instructed and return it to me in the stamped, self-addressed envelope. The total time involved should be less than fifteen minutes.

I would like to thank you in advance for helping me with my project. I feel it could be extremely valuable research and may help to tell us something about our beliefs.

Yours truly,

R. B. Bain

RBB/sp

APPENDIX K

GENERAL INFORMATION SHEET SENT TO EDUCATOR AND GENERAL POPULATION SAMPLE GROUPS

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Age in years __________.

2. Have you ever coached an athletic team of any sort?

YES ☐ NO ☐

3. Please state sport and years involved if YES

______________________________ ______

______________________________ ______

3. Have you ever taught school at any level?

YES ☐ NO ☐